THE CATHOLIC EPISCOPACY
IN AMERICA, 1789-1852

by

Jo Ann Manfra

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of History
in the Graduate College of
The University of Iowa

May, 1975

Thesis supervisors: Professor Robert R. Dykstra
Professor Sidney E. Mead

XUM

Graduate College
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

PH.D. THESIS

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Jo Ann Manfra

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of History at the May, 1975 graduation.

Thesis committee: Robert R. Dykstra
Thesis supervisor

Sidney E. Mead
Thesis supervisor

Theodore Dwight Bozeman
Member

James F. McCue
Member

Sydney V. James
Member

Linda K. Kerber
Member

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

I INTRODUCTION 1

II THE AMERICAN BISHOPS 6

III CHURCH-STATE PROBLEMATIC 61

IV EPISCOPACY AND PAPACY 118

V LAY TRUSTEEISM 158

VI CONCILIAR GOVERNMENT 194

VII EPISCOPACY AND THE ORDERS 213

VIII CONCLUSION 244

APPENDICES 250

A BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIALS 251

B SOME ECCLESIASTICAL TERMS 255

C THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY, 1789-1852 258

D CHURCH ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1789-1852 262

Page

E STATISTICAL DATA ON THE FIFTY-ONE BISHOPS CHOSEN BY THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY 264

F STATISTICAL DATA ON THE NINE BISHOPS CHOSEN BY ROME 270

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 274

XUM

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1	Catholic Population Increase in the United States by Immigration, 1790-1860	10
2	Nationalities of Catholic Immigrants to the United States and their Proportions of Total Catholic Immigrants, 1831-1860 . . .	11
3	Irish Immigrants and their Proportion of Total Catholic Increase, 1820-1860	13
4	Immigrational and Natural Growth of Irish Catholic Stock and its Proportion of Total Catholic Population, 1790-1860 . . .	14
5	Nativity of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy and Rome	18
6	Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Selected Periods	23
7	Educational Backgrounds of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy	25
8	Clerical Status of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy	28
9	Length of Time before Elevation that American-Chosen Bishops were in the Country by Decades	33
10	Pastoral Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades	34
11	Administrative Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades	36
12	Types of Administrative Apprenticeships of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy .	38

TABLE Page

13 Teaching Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades 40

14 Types of Teaching Apprenticeships of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy 42

15 Elevation Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by Five Year Intervals 44

16 Incumbency to 1852 of American-Chosen Bishops by Decades 45

17 American Catholics and their Proportion of the White Population of the United States in Selected Census Years 138

18 Catholic Immigrants to the United States and their Proportion of Total Immigrants, 1831-1860 140

A1 Codebook for Biographical Data 251

A2 Members of the American Hierarchy Arranged Chronologically According to Date of Appointment from November 6, 1789 to May 9, 1852 258

A3 American Sees Arranged Chronologically According to Date of Erection from November 6, 1789 to May 9, 1852 262

A4 Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Years 264

A5 Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Ages 265

A6 Ordination Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by Years 266

A7 Length of Time before Elevation that American-Chosen Bishops were in the Country by Years 267

XUM

TABLE Page

A8 Elevation Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by years 268

A9 Incumbency to 1852 of American-Chosen Bishops by Years 269

A10 Arrival in the United States of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 270

A11 Arrival in the United States of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Ages 270

A12 Ordination Ages of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 271

A13 Elevation Ages of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 271

A14 Incumbency to 1852 of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 272

A15 Pastoral Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 272

A16 Administrative Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 273

A17 Teaching Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years 273

I. INTRODUCTION

The sixty men who governed the Catholic Church in the United States during its formative period, from the appointment of the first bishop in 1789 through the eve of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852, faced a situation unprecedented in the annals of Roman Catholicism. They were charged with laying the foundation of an ecclesiastical institution for an ethnically heterogeneous Catholic population where only the barest rudiments of a traditional structure existed, and this in a social and political environment that was radically different from Europe and new in the history of Christendom. Whatever else can be said about the prelates, they recognized their peculiar situation, and determined to build a structure that was simultaneously Catholic and American. This decision had an external and internal dimension. On the one hand, it reflected pressure from the non-Catholic society to explain how an "alien" religious organization, which countenanced Roman political intervention and increased its constituency each year by welcoming foreign immigrants, could accommodate itself to American society. On the other hand, the bishops were not passive objects in the social and cultural developments of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Their response to the challenge of the American environment, the ideas they held, and the decisions they made suggest that they were a fiercely independent group of men aware of the theoretical and practical implications of religious pluralism in a democratic republic. The story of the emergence of a Catholic Church in the United States belongs then to both social and religious history; it was largely the result of the interplay between certain trends in the development of a nation and major currents in Catholic life and thought.

A collective biographical sketch of the total population sets the demographic background. Since the purpose of the portrait was to summarize patterns implicit in the prelates' raw biographical information by systematically studying the interrelationships of variables selected and defined from such data, quantitative analysis--employing descriptive statistics or techniques--was used. The portrait shows that the American hierarchy of the early national period had a New World collective personality. It was foreign-born but home-bred, and deliberately so. All but nine (or 85 per cent) of the sixty men elevated to that select body from its inception in 1789 through 1852 were seasoned American missionaries, trained and experienced in the United States, and chosen by their own colleagues, not Rome.

Moving from the bishops' demographic characteristics, the remainder of the study concentrates on how these men came to develop a deliberate and consistent commitment to build an integrative American ecclesiastical institution compatible with the Republic's principles of separation of church and state and religious freedom and yet also directly responsible to the Pope. In this process the dynamics of the relationship of the hierarchy to the Republic, to Rome, and to American Catholics were pivotal. Reflecting chiefly a New World perspective, the hierarchy is pictured as trying to make its way in the face of various and shifting pressures from non-Catholic America, from Rome, and from American Catholic clerics and laymen.

Sometimes initiating, sometimes responding to developments within American society and major currents in Catholic life and thought, the hierarchy eventually created a church with a distinct American theology and set of procedures, at least from the institutional dimension.

It was a church characterized on the one hand by the liberal theologies of separation of church and state and "episcopal collegiality" (the theory of Church polity that rejects Papal infallibility, placing the locus of authority in the body of bishops, either dispersed in their individual sees or meeting in a general council, and the Pope acting together). Certainly the prelates of the early national period were unswerving in their devotion and loyalty to Rome. But their fidelity displayed a distinctively American twist. They maintained that their allegiance belonged exclusively to the Pope, but that in both belief and practice such fealty was properly confined to spiritual matters and excluded politics.

Not simply a smoke screen for the clever opportunistic actions of sixty power-hungry bishops, theological liberalism was not merely ex animo either. It reflected the complex and eclectic nature of Roman Catholicism and the hierarchy's desire to follow an ethic of ultimate rather than political responsibility, in common with their Prostestant evangelical counterparts. It also reflected a keen understanding of what was necessary to subsist institutionally in the United States. After all, separation of church and state was at least as good, if not better, for the Catholic Church in America as Lyman Beecher believed it was for Congregationalism in Connecticut. And episcopal collegiality enhanced the bishops' decision-making power within the church itself.

On the other hand, it was a church characterized by the most authoritarian episcopal government in the history

XUM

of Western Catholicism. By 1829 experience with political republicanism and social pluralism had taught the bishops many things. Perhaps the most important lesson they learned was that the key to autonomous power lay in united action. In that year they revived conciliar government, or the practice of holding frequent legislative assemblies or councils, dormant since a session held in 1810. A strategy well adapted to containing Rome's waffling yet often constraining actions and American Catholic presbyterian tendencies, conciliar government was something more. It was the Catholic counterpart of Jacksonian America's organizational mania. The Catholic hierarchy's erection of sectarian boundaries was part of the larger process of the emergence of political parties and strongly institutionalized religious denominations in this period.

In short, these sixty bishops were more American than foreign, more democratic than monarchical, more adaptive than reactionary. Their seemingly paradoxical development of liberal theologies and an authoritarian polity is best understood as both an ideological commitment to the twin ideals of separation of church and state and religious freedom and a pragmatic accommodation to the American situation.

II. THE AMERICAN BISHOPS

One cannot hope to understand the nature of Catholic church governance without a grasp of who constituted the elite. Until now catalogs of the accomplishments of individual bishops or unsystematic examinations of ethnocultural groups of prelates who acted for or against "Americanization" have characterized the literature on the Catholic leadership.[1]

The second approach started with a controversy between Catholic University and Notre Dame schools of historians over the development of Catholic governance between the demise of the first bishop John Carroll and the Civil War. John Gilmary Shea and Peter Guilday, representing the Catholic University position, argued that the Anglo-French successors of Carroll were not adequate to the tradition of "Americanism" begun by Carroll, and that the precedent laid down by him was not picked up again until the Irish-born prelate John England arrived in Charleston in 1820. Shea and Guilday identified Irish-born bishops as culturally American, since they spoke English and adopted the United States as their country once they had landed.[2] But Thomas McAvoy, chief spokesman for the Notre Dame School, correctly took Shea

XUM

and Guilday to task for equating language and a desire to be compatible with "Americanism." McAvoy considered the Anglo-French prelates who followed Carroll as not only the legal but also the existential successors to Carroll, since they were a cultivated, educated, sophisticated group accepted as social equals by their American Protestant contemporaries.[3]

Disagreeing over what characteristics were necessary for a Carroll type or "natural" adaptation to American conditions and therefore over whether Irishmen or Frenchmen were better prepared to make such an adjustment, representatives of both schools nevertheless held two identical assumptions. First, they cast the bishops in an almost exclusively European theological mold. French or Irish-born prelates could or could not understand American conceptions of religious freedom and separation of church and state depending upon whether something in their European theological backgrounds allowed them to. Even the possibility that there may have been some distinctive theological thought, or perhaps the raw material for such thought, in the history of the American church, accordingly, has been denied. The accepted assumption has been that because America's Catholic elite was mainly foreign-born it was therefore destined to be theologically European.[4] Put simply, this view requires that American bishops, excepting only Irish-born and Roman-chosen John England, unquestionably accepted the European Catholic understanding of the intrinsic dependence of the civil upon the spiritual authority.

Secondly, in terms of the set of procedures the bishops adopted to organize the church, both schools of historians cast the elite in the image of their American lay constituents. Of course this is contrary to the way American history has traditionally been approached. Only recently has "bottom-up" history become popular as another if not more accurate measure of national development. Influenced by this "new" approach, historians of American Catholicism are clamoring for studies of the laity, insisting that the hierarchy was not the only maker of Catholic history.[5] This is of course indisputable. Yet an equally compelling fact remains: there has been no systematic study of the hierarchy. And those few authors who have dwelt on the leadership have seemed to presume--perhaps unwittingly--that the elite's acculturation was hardly more than the European migrants' adjustment to Protestant America. In short, the elite did whatever the laity was doing, or--given the incomplete status of lay studies--seemed to be doing. And Catholic lay activities have traditionally been viewed as more or less determined by European culture, although conditioned of course by American circumstances. If, therefore, lay Catholics had "adaptable" European backgrounds then they could adjust to or maybe even accept mainstream American culture. Such adaptation was a fortunate or unfortunate occurrence, depending upon how the particular writer defined or used such terms as Americanization, Americanism, acculturation, and assimilation.

Despite minor differences, therefore, Shea, McAvoy, and their followers all reached the same conclusion. By 1860 American Catholicism, leaders as well as led, was Irish--quantitatively and qualitatively.[6]

Of course, there is no denying the influence of European immigration in forming the American laity. Table 1 shows that in the thirty years before the Civil War well over half of all Catholic population increase in the United States came through immigration. In the decade from 1840 to 1850, immigration, in fact, accounted for nearly three-quarters of the increase. And Table 2 clearly indicates the dominance of the Irish in the two decades before the Civil War. Indeed, there was a sharp decline of the French, even if for the 1850's one assumes most immigrant Canadian Catholics to have been French-Canadian, French-speaking immigrants still amount to less than 10 per cent of the whole. On the other hand, there was a dramatic, although still not yet comparable, rise of German-born Catholic immigrants.

TABLE 1. Catholic Population Increase in the United States by Immigration, 1790-1860

	N	% of total Catholic increase
1790-1820	77,000	48.1
1821-1830	54,000	43.9
1831-1840	240,000	69.6
1841-1850	700,000	74.2
1851-1860	985,000	65.8

Source: Calculated from Gerald Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* (New York, 1969), 73, 117, 125, 134, 145.

TABLE 2. Nationalities of Catholic Immigrants to the United States and their Proportions of Total Catholic Immigrants, 1831-1860

	N	*%*
1831-1840		
Irish	144,545	60.2
German	38,876	16.2
French	33,867	14.1
All other	22,932	9.5
1841-1850		
Irish	530,890	75.8
German	110,831	15.8
French	25,000	3.6
All other	34,056	4.9
1851-1860		
Irish	602,000	61.1
German	244,887	24.9
French	58,414	5.9
Canadian	25,000	2.5
Swiss	13,989	1.4
All other	40,867	4.1

Source: Calculated from Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?*, 123, 131, 140.

As shown in Table 3, Irish-born immigrants accounted for important proportions of total Catholic population increase in the four decades between 1820 and the Civil War. In the 1840's, in fact, over half the total Catholic increase could be attributed to immigration from Ireland, while in the decades of the thirties and fifties the proportion stood at about 40 per cent. These data clearly support the concept of a heavily Irish laity in antebellum America. But of course they do not take into account those American Catholics of Irish-born parents, Irish-born grandparents, or some more remote Irish ancestry. Painstaking estimates of this total "Irish Catholic stock" for various pre-Civil War census years constitute the bases for the even larger proportions given in Table 4. Here we see that the Irish numerical influence, exceptionally high in 1790, hovered consistently about the 60 per cent mark in the 1820-1860 census years.

But can this Irish majority legitimately be seen as making for an "Irish church" in America? Not with a _non_-Irish minority of around 40 per cent, one would suppose. In any event, such an equation of sheer numerical strength with some overall ideological or psychological complexion is to confuse church polity with American politics; no lay majority ruled the church. The hierarchy's herculean actions, galvanized in 1829, to develop a corporate sense

TABLE 3. Irish Immigrants and their Proportion of Total Catholic Increase, 1820-1860

	Total Catholic Population Increase in U.S.	Net Catholic Immigration from Ireland	
	N	N	%
1820-1830	123,000	35,356	28.7
1831-1840	345,000	144,545	41.9
1841-1850	943,000	530,890	56.3
1851-1860	1,497,000	602,000	40.2

Source: Calculated from Shaughnessy, Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?, 114, 117, 123, 125, 131, 134, 140, 145.

XUM

TABLE 4. Immigrational and Natural Growth of Irish Catholic Stock and its Proportion of Total Catholic Population, 1790-1860

	All U.S. Catholics	U.S. Catholics of Irish Stock	
	N	N	%
1790	35,000	25,000	71.4
1820	195,000	112,000	57.4
1830	318,000	186,000	58.5
1840	663,000	388,000	58.5
1850	1,606,000	1,036,000	64.5
1860	3,103,000	1,963,000	63.3

Source: Calculated from Shaughnessy, *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?*, 73, 117, 125, 134, 145, 238.

within the American Catholic community suggests that the prelates, at least, viewed the laity as ethnically pluralistic rather than homogeneously Irish or anything else.

An important dimension of the Irish theory rests on the assertion that the collective personality of American Catholicism by 1852 was Irish. As suggested by various scholars, this so-called Irish personality was schizoid, or at least two-dimensional, having experimental, flexible, and efficient as well as rigid, narrow, and defensive attributes. Both dimensions were indigenously European Irish, with Bishop John England most often cited as the best example of the one and Bishop John Hughes of the other. (The fact that Hughes was brought to America when he was three and educated by the French Sulpicians is rather lightly dismissed.) American conditions in no way altered the substance of the Irish personality; they merely influenced which potential would become dominant. Since "old-stock" Americans responded to Irish Catholics negatively, the worst in the Irish personality surfaced. It was therefore quite natural that the defensive, "ghetto" propensity had triumphed by 1852 over the open experimental one. Manifested, according to the argument, in the ascendancy of the Hughes over the England type of bishop, the Irish mentality determined the course of the American Catholic church for some time to come.[7]

XUM

As it applies to the Catholic laity, the Irish personality thesis may be inadequate for at least two reasons. First, while adherents to this paradigm have not totally ignored it, neither have they sufficiently examined the effect of intramural ethno-cultural conflict on ante-bellum American Catholic development. As a significant source of conflict within the life of the church, ethnic pluralism has been treated seriously only for the last two decades of the nineteenth century, when the explosive German issue or so-called Cahensly episode rocked the church.[8] Secondly, even if one assumes that pre-Civil War lay Catholicism had an Irish personality, how, just to cite one striking example, would Irish lay initiative in the political dimension of Know Nothingism fit into the withdrawn or defensive posture supposedly assumed by that time?[9]

Perhaps the nuances between Catholic ethno-cultural pluralism and ante-bellum conditions and opportunities were more complex, rich, and subtle than previously assumed. (Recent studies of later immigrant groups, such as Humbert Nelli's on the Italians, suggest that--within the limits of individual abilities and aspirations--conditions and opportunities in the receiving country, rather than Old World backgrounds, determined at least the economic activities of the newcomers.)[10]

Clearly ethno-cultural pluralism was a persistent and deep-seated condition throughout the history of American Catholicism, emerging in the very early conflicts among English, French, Irish, and German subcultures. Played-off against this, however, are those New World conditions that profoundly affected Old World Catholic religious traditions and viewpoints, despite the beliefs of the immigrants themselves that they were merely recreating homeland life styles--a proposition old-stock Americans also believed. Perhaps this belief, coupled quite naturally with the clear numerical dominance of the Irish in the pre-Civil War years, created the Irish church thesis that scholars of American Catholicism have nurtured ever since.

When applied to the hierarchy, the Irish thesis, as well as the earlier-mentioned European theological model, are definitely myths. The American hierarchy of the early national period had a New World collective personality, and deliberately so.[11]

On the one hand, the hierarchy was unquestionably foreign-born. Forty-five (or 75 per cent) of the bishops appointed from the creation of that body, through the eve of the First Plenary Council in 1852, were born in Europe, as shown in Table 5.[12]

TABLE 5. Nativity of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy and Rome

	Appointment Authority			
	American (N=51)		Roman (N=9)	
	N	%	N	%
France	18	35.2		
Ireland	10	19.6	5	55.6
United States	15	29.4		
Belgium	3	5.8		
Canada			3	33.3
England	1	2.0		
Germany	1	2.0		
Italy	1	2.0		
Mexico			1	11.1
Spain	1	2.0		
Switzerland	1	2.0		

Nearly three-quarters of these European-born prelates came from either France or Ireland. Contrary to common belief, however, the Irish at no time outnumbered the French- or American-born. Interestingly enough, the hierarchy itself selected only ten Irish members; the other five were chosen by Rome over the American bishops' vehement protests. Furthermore, the bishops, except several Roman appointees, preferred to elevate native-born priests.[13] More than a quarter of the fifty-one episcopal candidates sponsored by the hierarchy was born in the United States, these fifteen compatriots representing only three less than the most numerous European contingent, the French. Ten of the natives were at least third-generation Americans, with English antecedents. Also of English stock were three of the five second-generation natives, the other two being Irish in background. When it came to deciding who among them should receive higher status, the bishops showed an even clearer nativist bent. Five (or one-third) of the fifteen cohorts they promoted to the rank of archbishop were American-born.[14]

Despite the hierarchy's preference for native-born colleagues, the fact still remains that foreigners clearly dominated. But the overwhelming majority of these foreign-born leaders were American-bred, and intentionally so. Forced by circumstances to select mainly foreign-born colleagues, the incumbents came to place their hopes for the creation of a national governing elite on American training and experience. Put another way, the bishops quite early adopted a program whereby future bishops, regardless of nativity, were assimilated and committed to the attitudes and values of those already in power. Achieving episcopal status in America clearly became dependent upon attaining goals that were defined and shared by the tenured leaders.

It was no accident, therefore, that all but nine of the foreign-born bishops were chosen by the hierarchy, not Rome. For the American bishops self-selection became an extremely important and effective instrument of control, a means to impose order upon an emerging and ethnically pluralistic church and reduce the chasm between the culture of Catholicism and that of Protestant America. Certainly this is why they waged the protracted, intense, and often bitter campaign, subsequently described, to win the self-selection privilege from Rome. Once they had gained it, the prelates protected their control against strong pressures from clerics and laymen at home and Church authorities abroad.[15]

By centering structural control on American training and experience the bishops intended to create a strategy that was sound defensively and offensively. Defensively, the program was designed to keep episcopal ethnic factionalism within proper perspective. If there was to be one Catholic church in America, a church relatively free from external or European control, then ethno-cultural distinctions simply could not be allowed to divert the hierarchy's attention away from substantive issues. Of course, no amount of pre-episcopal coaching in the American style could or did prevent the bishops from privately and at times even publicly manifesting persistent and ingrained ethno-cultural ideologies, emotions, and antagonisms. But then the prelates neither intended to achieve the impossible nor spent much time worrying about perfection, unless it involved personal spirituality. Besides, these men seemed to enjoy a certain amount of differing among themselves, so long as individual and factional disputes remained subordinate to collective goals. Offensively, the plan was supposed to result in a distinctively American governing elite, in contrast to a "French" or an "Irish" one. Embracing their peculiar circumstances, the bishops came to believe that this was the only way to succeed at the business of creating one integrated American Catholic church.

XUM

All thirty-six of the American-selected foreigners (or 80 per cent of the foreign-born prelates) were indeed well-acclimated by the dates of their appointments. Collectively they came to the new Republic during the infancy of the hierarchy and at the beginnings of their own priestly careers. More than half were in their adopted country by 1820. The average year of entrance, 1817, is relatively early because only two bishops--both natives--governed the church from 1789 to 1808 and ten from 1808 until 1820.[16] As Table 6 shows, there were no significant differences along ethnic lines, except that no French-born bishops-to-be came to the United States in the 1820's, while seven Frenchmen arrived between 1830 and 1852, probably due primarily to religious conditions in France. At least half of the men in each nationality group were in the country by 1820.[17] Twenty per cent of their American-born counterparts had left America in their early teens, spending an average of twenty-four years studying and traveling in Europe. At least half had returned home by 1820. The natives collectively were nearing forty when they came home, whereas the foreigners immigrated at an average age of twenty-six.[18] Of course, this meant that they were already priests when they got here. Only a minority of all the American-chosen bishops, regardless of nativity,

TABLE 6. Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Selected Periods[a]

	French (N=18)		Irish (N=10)		Other (N=8)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1789-1820	11	61.1	5	50.0	4	50.0
1821-1829			3	30.0	3	37.5
1830-1852	7	38.9	2	20.0	1	12.5

[a] This periodization reflects what the bishops themselves believed were distinctive phases in the "Americanization" process. During the first period the pendulum of power began to swing toward American laymen and European Church authorities; the second period saw the pendulum swing toward episcopacy; and after 1829 the bishops protected and further centralized episcopal authority by instituting conciliar government.

were actually ordained in the United States; 72 per cent had taken their final priestly vows by the time they were twenty-five, which was common for the period, or before most of the newcomers' first entry and the natives' reentry into America.[19]

By the eventful year of 1829 then, all but ten of the foreign-born future bishops had arrived in the United States as a youthful contingent of freshly ordained priests. In that year those among them who had already been elevated joined older native-born colleagues in a dramatic demonstration of their Americanization by gathering in Baltimore to convene the first of seven national councils, to be examined here later in some detail. All these assemblies were controlled by the American hierarchy, not by Roman or other European Church authorities. And the resultant legislation differed markedly in substance and impact from that of analogous episcopal gatherings in Europe.[20]

The educational backgrounds of the American-appointed bishops shed further light on the phenomenon of 1829 and its subsequent reaffirmations. As most of these men were priests when they entered or--in the case of a fifth of the natives--reentered America, so they would have had to be educated someplace else. Glancing quickly at Table 7 affirms the expected, namely that the

TABLE 7. Educational Backgrounds of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy

	Place of Education					
	United States (N=7)		Europe (N=28)		Both (N=16)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
French			15	83.3	3	16.7
Irish	1	10.0	5	50.0	4	40.0
American	6	40.0	4	26.7	5	33.3
Other			4	50.0	4	50.0

XUM

hierarchy was educated in Europe. More than half of the bishops completed their formal studies abroad, a sharp contrast to the almost insignificant number educated solely in America.

Frenchmen were clearly the most European-educated. This is understandable, since nine of them who emigrated to this country before 1830 were members of the French teaching Order of St. Sulpice. When circumstances associated with the French Revolution threatened the independence of that Order at home, the Sulpician superiors sent a contingent of their finest teachers to America, primarily to educate Catholic boys for the priesthood and only if absolutely necessary to work as pastors from time to time. It was these men who laid the foundation for American Catholic classical and vocational education, along with their European-trained Jesuit counterparts. The Jesuits, primarily of native and of English birth, founded Georgetown College in Georgetown, D.C., to provide classical educations for young men. The Sulpicians established St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, to mold any Georgetown graduate desiring a vocation into a priest for the American mission. In 1808 the Sulpicians began impinging upon the Jesuits' monopoly in the liberal arts by opening their own undergraduate college, Mount St. Mary's in Emmitsburg, Maryland.[21]

Most of the bishops with exclusive American educations did at least part of their academic work at one or more of these three institutions.

Another, and for our purposes a perhaps more significant role, was also played by the men at St. Mary's, the Mount, and Georgetown. They spearheaded the educational dimension of the bishops' Americanizing program, teaching many of the prelates who display combined European and American educations. Almost a third of the bishops who had come to this country as priests were reeducated in American colleges and seminaries. Of course, the Sulpicians and Jesuits directed their own schools. Yet by virtue of its authority and the peculiar religious circumstances in America, the hierarchy strongly influenced important decision-making at all three of these educational institutions. In addition, more than two-fifths of the priests the American hierarchy elevated before 1830 had themselves belonged to one of the two orders (see Table 8).[22] Nevertheless, neither the Sulpicians nor the Jesuits ever willingly submitted to episcopal pressures.[23]

Surely this was one of the reasons why the bishops began going into the education business for themselves. In the process, they came to wield an indisputable domination over the educational policies of diocesan

TABLE 8. Clerical Status of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy

	Regular (N=23)					
	Sulpician (N=9)		Jesuit (N=6)		Other (N=8)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1789-1820	4	50.0	2	25.0	1	12.5
1821-1829	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.8
1830-1852	4	11.1	3	8.3	4	11.1

	Secular (N=28)	
	N	%
1789-1820	1	12.5
1821-1829	2	28.6
1830-1852	25	69.4

XUM

seminaries and colleges, even when they recruited some or all of the faculties for such schools from the religious orders. One manifestation of these developments was a clash between the episcopacy and the orders, or so-called "regular" clergy, for hegemony over the future of American Catholic education, as later documented.[24]

The growth of diocesan institutions of higher education was a dramatic turning point in the history of Catholic education, a development that has been either ignored or misconstrued. It did not doom American Catholicism to intellectual bankruptcy. It did signify a shift from an Eastern-based regular monopoly to a more geographically diffused sharing by regulars and prelates of American Catholic intellectual development. It also signified episcopal authority, rather than just influence, over the educational dimension of Americanization by 1830. Some bishops even began to dream of one national institution, under episcopal direction, where a unified effort could be made to produce an Americanized priesthood that would assure succession to the hierarchy of properly qualified and disciplined men. This dream did not materialize until 1889 when the Catholic University of America was established in Washington, D.C.[25]

In the interim, the prelate-directed schools did successfully compete with their regular-directed counterparts. One index of this was the increase in the number of secular priests (that is, non-regulars) elevated to the hierarchy by 1830, as depicted in Table 8.[26] Yet clerical status was not necessarily synonymous with the kind of educational institution a priest attended. That is to say, an increase in secular bishops did not in itself signify a concomitant trend toward elevation of men educated in diocesan schools. Actually many of the secular bishops had received at least part of their education in institutions controlled by religious orders. Attending a school owned and administered by the regular clergy could, but did not necessarily, result in formal affiliation with a religious order. On the other hand, a priest who attended a prelate-directed diocesan college or seminary might indeed decide to apply eventually for membership in one of the religious orders. (This was an uncommon occurrence among clerics elevated to the hierarchy, in part because the bishops legislated to themselves the sole authority to grant permission for such affiliation.)[27] By 1830, however, the increase in the number of secular bishops did indeed coincide with an increase in the number of years they had spent in prelate-controlled educational institutions, regardless of whether or not they had also attended one of the schools directed by a religious society.

Whether members of prestigious religious orders or secular priests, American-chosen bishops were more than just vocationally trained. Thirty-eight (or 74.5 per cent) graduated from a university or college before entering seminary. And twenty-six of these did their undergraduate and professional work in separate schools, while the rest completed a classical curriculum, then trained for the priesthood in the same institution. Only thirteen went directly from secondary school into a seminary. Clearly the natives and the Irish had the most diverse educations, with the French falling between them and the few other foreign-born prelates.

Educated in the United States, in Europe, or both places, all of the American-selected bishops shared a common experience. The quality of their education was high; they either attended good schools in France and England or were trained by men who had. And if they spent any time at all in America's colleges or seminaries, they most certainly were, as one bishop put it, encouraged to "imbibe American culture."[28]

Clerical advancement into the governing elite was also dependent upon attaining professional as well as educational goals defined and shared by those already in power. To begin with, this meant being seasoned in the American mission. Collectively the foreign-borns had been in the country an average of 17.6 years before elevation. As Table 9 shows, 72.2 per cent had spent eleven or more pre-episcopal years in America, with nationality groups once again looking very much alike.[29]

Pastoral activities were definitely the most widely shared pre-episcopal apprenticeships. Forty-five (or 88.2 per cent) of the prelates had worked in congregations an average of 16.4 years. Certainly the largest number--thirty-two--had done so exclusively in America. Only two administered exclusively to European Catholics, while eleven had done some pastoral work in both places. And, as Table 10 shows, nearly half of the bishops had been involved in American pastoral activities for eleven or more years. If a priest could succeed at the grass roots level in gaining the admiration and respect of his congregation without "selling out" to the lay trustees who frequently held the purse strings, then the hierarchy generally assumed he was pious, loyal, and capable of delivering persuasive sermons.

When a cleric had the personal and pastoral qualifications for episcopal consideration, he was often placed in an administrative position. During their priestly careers three-quarters of the bishops had spent an

TABLE 9. Length of Time before Elevation that American-Chosen Bishops were in the Country by Decades

	French (N=18)		Irish (N=10)		Other (N=8)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	4	22.2	3	30.0	3	37.5
11-20	7	38.9	4	40.0	2	25.0
21-30	5	27.8	2	20.0	2	25.0
31-43	2	11.1	1	10.0	1	12.5

TABLE 10. Pastoral Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades[a]

	United States (N=43)							
	French (N=15)		Irish (N=8)		American (N=13)		Other (N=7)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	6	40.0	3	37.5	6	46.1	5	71.4
11-20	7	46.7	5	62.5	6	46.1	2	28.6
21-30	2	13.3			1	7.8		
	Europe (N=13)							
	French (N=7)		Irish (N=1)		American (N=2)		Other (N=3)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	4	57.1	1	100.0	1	50.0	3	100.0
11-20	3	42.9			1	50.0		
21-30								

[a] Eleven men who worked in both places were included in both geographical categories.

average of 12.9 years in ecclesiastical administration. Here too, the largest number--thirty-two--were involved in such work only in America, with at least half of the men in each nationality group sharing this experience (see Table 11).

American experience was even more pronounced in administration than it was with respect to pastorates relative to the number of men with pastoral backgrounds. There was a good reason for this. Because of the unique system of voluntary religious support, familiarity with the American Catholic decision-making process was very important. Administrative success in the United States was certainly more difficult and probably more significant as an index of governing ability than was European experience, at least from the American hierarchy's perspective. This was especially true as the bishops moved toward control of the economic affairs (or, as they put it, "temporalities") of the church. On the other hand, would-be bishops spent an average of three-and-a-half years more as pastors than as administrators. Aside from the obvious fact that more congregational than administrative positions were available, other considerations contributed to this. Generally a cleric was made an administrator only after he had proven himself a good pastor and sometimes even a good

XUM

TABLE 11. Administrative Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades[a]

	United States (N=35)							
	French (N=13)		Irish (N=5)		American (N=11)		Other (N=6)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	7	53.8	5	100.0	9	81.8	6	100.0
11-20	4	30.8			2	18.2		
21-30	2	15.4						

	Europe (N=6)							
	French (N=3)		Irish (N=2)		American (N=0)		Other (N=1)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	3	100.0	1	50.0			1	100.0
11-20			1	50.0				
21-30								

---

[a] Three men who worked in both places were included in both geographical categories.

teacher. All but five of the pre-episcopal administrators had some pastoral training and twenty had taught. Also, a priest commonly continued his pastorate after assuming a decision-making position.[30]

As administrators, would-be bishops assisted their future colleagues in directing the spiritual as well as business affairs of dioceses and ordering the activities of Catholic educational institutions, or both, sometimes simultaneously.[31] All but two were involved in some way with diocesan or educational decision-making, as depicted in Table 12, with analagous patterns emerging for each nationality group. This kind of training provided seemingly otherwise qualified priests with experience in making and enforcing spiritual and temporal or business decisions. Church administration thus was yet another way the bishops prepared a cleric to move to the level where responsibility for making final decisions rested and at the same time tested his leadership potential.

Certainly bishop-administrators did not overshadow bishops as teachers and theologians in the early national period. The caricature of the twentieth-century Catholic prelate, also applied to his Protestant counterpart, as businessman and public relations specialist dabbling in theology is commonplace. But these early leaders seemed convinced that their success depended upon achieving two

XUM

TABLE 12. Types of Administrative Apprenticeships of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy

	French (N=15)		Irish (N=6)		American (N=11)		Other (N=6)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Diocesan	4	26.7	1	16.7	2	18.2	3	50.0
Educational	4	26.7	1	16.7	5	45.5	2	33.3
Other	1	6.7	1	16.7			1	16.7
Diocesan and Educational	5	33.3	3	50.0	2	18.2		
Diocesan and Other					2	18.2		
Educational and Other	1	6.7						

equally important objectives. The first involved dominating the spiritual lives of their communicants, which experience with a voluntary system taught them was closely related to control of Catholic temporalities--land, money, houses of worship, and schools. The second objective was to define the right relationship of their church to Rome and to the Republic. In order to accomplish the second, they believed they had to have some among them who were theologians as well as administrators. And they did. Keeping one eye on clerics with administrative ability, they kept their other on the theological acumen of future prospects.[32] This was easy, since the bishops either influenced or dominated the new Republic's Catholic colleges and seminaries.

At first glance teaching appears the least commonly shared of the three kinds of pre-episcopal apprenticeships, since only twenty-four (or 47.1 per cent) of the bishops had taught an average of 12.8 years during their priestly careers. It was, however, as ordinary for an educational administrator to teach courses as it was for a diocesan administrator to continue his pastoral duties. All the leading bishop-theologians, for example, had done both.[33] If the educational data of Table 12 is considered along with that of Table 13, then teaching is indeed in

XUM

TABLE 13. Teaching Apprenticeships of American-Chosen Bishops in the United States and Europe by Decades[a]

	United States (N=20)							
	French (N=9)		Irish (N=3)		American (N=5)		Other (N=3)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	5	55.6	3	100.0	2	40.0	3	100.0
11-20	2	22.2			3	60.0		
21-30	2	22.2						
	Europe (N=10)							
	French (N=7)		Irish (N=1)		American (N=2)		Other (N=0)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-10	7	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0		
11-20								
21-30								

[a] Six men who worked in both places were included in both geographical categories.

closer harmony with pastoral and administrative work as a professional activity generally shared by members of the hierarchy.

A relatively higher percentage of teachers than either pastors or administrators worked exclusively in Europe or both there and in America (see Table 13). Of course many of the would-be bishops who taught were either Sulpicians or Jesuits, with the Sulpicians having been sent to America specifically to teach. For example, seven of the eleven French bishops with teaching experience had taught either solely in Europe or there and in America. Since the Irishmen and other foreign-born prelates generally went back to school when they arrived, most tended to be students rather than teachers while serving as pastors and perhaps even administrators.

Table 14 reveals the kinds of institutions these men taught in. Indeed the trends are compatible with the early American style of separate Catholic schools for classical and vocational education. (Only one man taught in a combined college and seminary, and he did so in Europe.) Strikingly, the pattern itself reflects the educational backgrounds of the men who established it--the bishops and the regular clergy.

Finally, there was no generation gap between members of the hierarchy. Naturally the prelates were inbred,

XUM

XUM

TABLE 14. Types of Teaching Apprenticeships of Bishops Chosen by the American Hierarchy

	French (N=11)		Irish (N=3)		American (N=7)		Other (N=3)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
College	3	27.2			4	57.1	1	33.3
Seminary	4	36.4			1	14.3	2	66.7
College and Seminary Combined			1	33.3				
College and Seminary Separately	4	36.4	2	28.6	2	28.6		

having highly similar backgrounds and apprenticeships. But the age of the group also accounted for this (see Table 15). American bishops selected colleagues who were an average of 41.8 years old. French clerics were the oldest, elevated at the average age of 45.6. At thirty-nine, the Irish were collectively the youngest, joining the select body three years before the natives and two years sooner than the other foreign-born prelates.[34]

These neophytes joined colleagues who were their seniors by slightly more than a decade. While more than half the prelates governed from one to eleven years, only about one-tenth did so for longer than twenty-one, as shown in Table 16. Taken together, then, the fifty-one bishops ruled the church an average of 10.9 years. And the incumbents were an average of 52.7 years old.[35] Furthermore, during their incumbency the fifteen American-chosen archbishops were not much older than the rest of the hierarchy. Since they had been promoted at the rather young age of fifty-four and served in that capacity an average of 3.8 years, the archbishops were collectively only five years older than their suffragan or subordinate colleagues.

Certainly what has emerged thus far is a composite of fifty-one men with similar backgrounds and widely

TABLE 15. Elevation Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by Five Year Intervals

	French (N=18)		Irish (N=10)		American (N=15)		Other (N=8)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
30-35	2	11.1	4	40.0	4	26.7	2	25.0
36-40	3	16.7	2	20.0	2	13.3	3	37.5
41-45	4	22.2	2	20.0	4	26.7	1	12.5
46-50	4	22.2	2	20.0	3	20.0		
51-55	3	16.7			2	13.3	1	12.5
56-62	2	11.1					1	12.5

XUM

TABLE 16. Incumbency to 1852 of American-Chosen Bishops by Decades

	French (N=18)		Irish (N=10)		American (N=15)		Other (N=8)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1-11	10	55.5	6	60.0	7	46.7	7	87.5
12-21	6	33.3	3	30.0	6	40.0	1	12.5
22-31	1	5.6	1	10.0	2	13.3		
32-41	1	5.6						

shared pre-episcopal training in the church they governed, regardless of country of birth. Recently ordained priests, they came to the Republic during Catholicism's earliest organizational era. Together they matured in the new mission, laboring side by side for an average of seventeen years as pastors, administrators, and educators. Some even had post-ordination educations while serving as priests to congregations or administrative assistants to prelates or directors of seminaries and colleges, usually under the tutelage of their future bishop-colleagues.

The emergence of this rather homogeneous Americanized leadership resulted from a conscious, consistent, and coherent pattern of bishop-making, not random and unstructured behavior or historical accident. Striking proof of this was, as we shall see, the relationship with Rome the hierarchy devised.[36] Opponents of Roman interference in American church affairs, the bishops characterized such meddling as inefficient and confusing. But they reserved a special dislike for Roman selection of their colleagues, fearing the divisive influence these "foreigners"--as the American hierarchy referred to Rome's protégés--with their penchant for catering to compatriot laymen in America against episcopal authority, might have on institutional development. Certainly the hierarchy deplored Rome's apparent proclivity for filling

American episcopal posts with ill-educated and partially qualified men, at least in comparison to the criteria the bishops employed in screening candidates. After all, only four of the Roman appointees could preach in English, a very important requirement. To make matters worse, one of the four was an admitted near-illiterate when it came to the English language.[37]

Dramatizing the importance the bishops attached to Americanization as the only way to create a viable leadership are the quite different backgrounds and training of the nine prelates that Rome selected and that the hierarchy in one way or another rejected. The personal, educational, and professional characteristics of Rome's nine, while similar to one another, were indeed quite different from those of America's fifty-one.

Rome's appointees came to the New World much later than their American-selected counterparts. Collectively the "foreigners" arrived in 1831, or a good fourteen years after the fifty-one prelates had.[38] Ethnically less diverse than their inbred colleagues, Rome's bishops were either Irishmen or other foreign-born persons (see Table 5). The nine men did not come to America until they were almost fifty, or much older than the rest of their American-selected colleagues had been.[39] This was natural enough, since all nine immigrated as bishops

XUM

rather than as newly ordained priests, like the fifty-one. Actually the "foreigners" had been somewhat younger than the rest of the hierarchy when ordained to the priesthood.[40] As we shall see, their vocational educations suffer in contrast to the more sophisticated schooling of the American appointees. Naturally this could not be corrected by sending the nine bishops back to school once they had arrived in the United States, or for that matter by any other kind of pre-governing exposure to American conditions.

Since these nine men came to America as consecrated bishops, they immediately joined the hierarchy in the business of church governance. Interestingly, the elevation ages of the American appointees, regardless of nationality, were closer to one another than to that of their Roman-chosen countrymen, who had been collectively older than their "Americanized" compatriots when made bishops.[41] Indeed, the largest generation gap in the entire hierarchy was not between different ethnic groups but rather among compatriots, since Rome's five Irishmen were the oldest incumbents while America's Irishmen were the youngest. Together, the "foreigners" governed about as long as the rest of the prelates, or for around a decade.[42] All the same, the nine were almost five years older than the rest of the incumbents and separated by sixteen years from the neophytes.

The educational training of the nine prelates differed even more from their fellow-bishops than their personal backgrounds. All completed their schooling in Europe. And six had only vocational educations. Put differently, a majority of the nine never had attended a college or a university. Instead they had proceeded directly from secondary into professional schools, like a quarter of their American-selected cohorts. Rome's Irishmen, for example, did not have nearly as diverse educations as America's. Even the American and Roman groups' vocational or "seminary only" contingents were distinguishable by the quality of their narrow educations. A fourth of the men the American hierarchy had elevated were indeed limited to vocational training, but all had attended seminaries either run by the Sulpicians or the Jesuits orders with European reputations for providing excellent educations. None of the nine men did. Nor were any affiliated with either prestigious order, whereas 60 per cent of all the regulars the American bishops picked as colleagues had been either Jesuits or Sulpicians (see Table 8).[43]

Naturally the pre-episcopal professional careers of Rome's nine bishops were also dissimilar from those of America's fifty-one. All nine lacked training in the American mission. Never had the five Irishmen among them ever set foot in the United States until they became bishops. Even the New World exposure of three of the other "foreigners" was, by American standards, essentially "foreign." One had worked in the Southwest and two in the Northwest, but before either area had come under the political auspices of the United States or the religious control of that nation's Catholic hierarchy.[44] On the one hand, the "foreign" bishops had the same kinds of pre-episcopal apprenticeships as the "Americans." They too had been pastors, administrators, and educators. And like the other bishops, most of the nine had worked in two or more of these fields; half of the administrators had taught and all but two of the administrators and educators had been pastors.[45]

It was the quality of the nine men's priestly internships that was so different. In common with the American hierarchy, Rome elevated priests who had worked with laymen in congregations, bishops in the bureaucracy, and future clerics in colleges and seminaries. But Rome's men had carried on all these activities in Europe, not in the United States. The hierarchy's acceptance of a priest as a legitimate colleague definitely depended upon where and by whom he was educated and trained, not his birthplace. In the minds of the fifty-one, therefore, the nine were incapable of understanding and, as a result, correctly governing the American church.

Thus the nationally selected bishops actively opposed the policy of Roman appointments to their select body. By 1820 Rome had tacitly consented to allow the hierarchy the privilege of selecting its own membership. No Roman appointments were made between that year and 1829. Fourteen years later, when the question of Rome's interference in the selection process rose again, the bishops acted with precise cleverness. They blocked the activities of Rome's three Canadian appointees by defeating their plans to dominate the church in the American West and by exerting enough pressure to have two of them transferred out of the hierarchy. The prelates had benefited from past experience, of course, since earlier they had used similar tactics in the East against Rome's Irishmen.[46]

By training and selecting their own colleagues, the bishops could afford to be tolerant and flexible enough to fight a common cause without sacrificing their individual identities or strongly held opinions, and more mature leaders did not worry about a generation gap. After all, they had chosen men who were aware of their community of interests. The prelates therefore could easily allow, indeed support, a certain amount of intramural dispute. And they could also propel their younger colleagues forward on the basis of merit. Such understanding, along with the ability and necessity to compromise, permitted even the most strongly opinionated--by no means dogmatic--among them to subordinate their own personalities to the goals of the collectivity. Thus were they equipped to elevate their church above the conflicts that could have torn it apart and rendered it helpless.

The American bishops were also products of their age and status, but they were certainly not simple democrats. They attempted to put together a cohesive governing elite capable of forging one institution with a central locus of authority out of a pluralistic constituency bent upon presbyterianism, or a church polity without an episcopacy.[47] Eventually this led them to refuse to share the decision-making process with American laymen and even priests. Instead, the bishops came to demand a virtual monopoly over the life of their church, not only at the expense of Rome but of American communicants and clerics.

Not primarily the result of any European mind-set, Irish or otherwise, the movement toward Catholic episcopal hegemony, as it unfolded, closely reflected a mainstream American reaction to political democracy and religious pluralism. Like their Protestant counterparts, Catholic leaders had learned from experience what it took to succeed as a religious group with a distinct identity in a nation that at least officially sanctioned competition for souls. Just as Protestant non-evangelical officials clearly became infected with an organizational mania, so America's Catholic governors caught the same highly communicable enthusiasm. Of course, the trend toward integration was hardly peculiar to religious denominations. More accurately, the tendency reflected and in turn influenced a general national mood. In fact, the organizational impulse was probably one of the most observable characteristics of Jacksonian America, the emergence of new, popularly based political parties being only one expression.[48] It was against this background that the Catholic bishops established a distinctively American Catholic church.

XUM

Notes

[1] See John Tracy Ellis, *A Guide to American Catholic History* (Milwaukee, 1959), for works on the hierarchy up to 1959. Well-known examples of the "catalog" approach are: Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John Carroll* (2 vols.; New York, 1922); John Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, First Archbishop of New York* (New York, 1866); Annabelle Melville, *Jean Lefebvre de Cheverus, 1768-1836* (Milwaukee, 1958), and *John Carroll of Baltimore: Founder of the American Catholic Hierarchy* (New York, 1955); Sebastian Messmer, ed., *The Works of the Rt. Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston* (7 vols.; Cleveland, 1908); Hugh Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851* (Washington, 1848).

[2] John Gilmary Shea, *The History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (4 vols.; New York, 1886-1892); Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England, 1786-1845* (2 vols.; New York, 1927).

[3] Thomas McAvoy, "The American Catholic Minority in the Later Nineteenth Century," *Review of Politics*, XV (July 1953), 275-302; McAvoy, "The Catholic Minority in the United States, 1789-1821," *Historical Records and Studies*, XXXIXXL (1952), 33-50; McAvoy, "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820-1860," *Review of Politics*, X (January 1948), 13-34.

[4] Ibid.; John Tracy Ellis, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life," *Thought*, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 353-358, 360-372, 374-378, 385, 386. James Hennesey initiated the challenge to this thesis, pointing to indications of a distinctive American theology at the First Vatican Council in 1869. One of his students, Margaret Mary Reher, recently applied Hennesey's ideas to the so-called "Americanist Heresy." Hennesey, *The First Council of the Vatican: The American Experience* (New York, 1963); Reher, "Americanism--A Theological Issue?" (paper presented at the conference on the Reinterpretation of American Catholic History, University of Notre Dame, October 1974).

[5] Philip Gleason, ed., *Catholicism in America* (New York, 1970). An entire session at the conference on the Reinterpretation of American Catholic History

XUM

was devoted to "Catholics and New Ethnic Studies." And at the session on "New Approaches In American Catholic History," two of the four papers given urged the study of Catholicism from the "bottom-up." Robert F. Hueston, "The Irish"; John Briggs, "The Italians"; Arunas Alisauskas, "The Lithuanians"; Margaret E. Connors, "Kinship and Culture among the Catholic Families of Albany, N.Y."; Jay P. Dolan, "American Catholics and Popular Religion."

[6] See especially Andrew Greeley, *The Catholic Experience: An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism* (New York, 1967). Quite recently, Donna Merwick discovered that Boston's priests, regardless of nativity, desired to be more than mere observers of the local scene, and consequently a number of them were "significantly affected by the surrounding Yankee culture." When in 1907 the Curia appointed a Roman-trained man--William H. O'Connell--as Bishop of Boston, things began to change. Of course, this lends weight to my findings regarding the bishops' Americanization program, explained on the following pages. Merwick, *Boston Priests, 1848-1910: A Study of Social and Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, 1973).

[7] See those works by Shea, Guilday, McAvoy, and Greeley already cited. Ray Allen Billington, while suggesting that the Irish played an active role in bringing about nativist attacks against the Catholic church in the Northeast, in larger part portrayed Catholics as passive victims of pre-Civil War nativism. Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (New York, 1938).

[8] Robert D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Chicago, 1958); Philip Gleason, *The Conservative Reformers: German-American Catholics and the Social Order* (Notre Dame, 1968). During the 1880's and the 1890's, the German Catholics made strenuous efforts to persuade Rome to choose more German prelates for the American church. Peter Cahensly, a German merchant, organized a conference at Lucerne for the larger purpose of protecting the religious and social interests of German Catholic emigrants. In the memorial the delegates to the conference sent to Rome was a request that more foreign language-speaking bishops be installed in America.

XUM

[9] See chap. v for a discussion of Irish Catholics and the Know Nothing movement.

[10] Humbert S. Nelli, *Italians In Chicago, 1880-1930: A Study In Ethnic Mobility* (New York, 1970).

[11] The sixty men studied served as ordinary bishops--occupants of residential sees with "ordinary" as opposed to "delegated" jurisdiction--and titular bishops, or coadjutors of residential sees, assistants to ordinary bishops, or vicars-apostolic (Papal administrators) of the United States territories. See Appendices B, C, and D for an explanation of some ecclesiastical terms and lists of the bishops and of American dioceses. The two Floridas and Alabama, Texas, Oregon, and Kansas were the territories. All except Kansas (the Diocese of Kansas City was erected in 1877) became American sees prior to 1852.

[12] Programs used to analyze the data were taken from *The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (New York, 1970). See Appendix A for the codebook for the biographical data. Aside from individual biographies, autobiographies, and primary source material, the raw biographical information was collected from: Richard H. Clarke, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States: Biographical Sketches from the Living Bishops* (2 vols.; Philadelphia, 1890); Clarke, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States* (3 vols.; Philadelphia, 1888); Joseph B. Code, *Dictionary of the American Hierarchy* (New York, 1940, 1964); James Dominick Hackett, *Bishops of the United States of Irish Birth and Descent* (New York, 1936); John Gilmary Shea, *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1886-1892); Owen Bernard Corrigan, "Chronological List Showing the Dates of Appointment of the Bishops of the United States," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV (1924), 295-324; Corrigan, "Chronology of the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States," *The Catholic Historical Review*, I (January 1916), 367-389; Corrigan, "Episcopal Succession in the United States," ibid., II (July 1917), 127-145; Corrigan, "Rise of the Hierarchy in the United States," ibid., II (October 1916), 282-301; Corrigan, "Chronology of the American Hierarchy," ibid., III (July 1917), 22-33, 151-164 and IV (1918), 80-83; Corrigan, "Titular Sees of the American Hierarchy," ibid., VI (October 1920), 322-330;

XUM

Peter Guilday, "Guide to the Biographical Sources of the American Hierarchy (A-L)," ibid., V (1919-1920), 120-128, 290-296 and VI (1920-1921), 128-132, 267-271.

[13] See chap. iv.

[14] There were actually sixteen archbishops, since Rome conferred that status on Canadian-born Francis Blanchet. Aside from the five natives, three of the archbishops were Frenchmen, four were Irishmen, and four were other foreign-born persons.

[15] The American hierarchy was the only body of bishops in the Roman Catholic Church that came to have the privilege of independently selecting its own membership.

[16] Baltimore was the only official American diocese until 1808. John Carroll was the bishop and Leonard Neale the coadjutor of that see. Appendix D shows the Diocese of New Orleans, originally called Louisiana and the Two Floridas, as erected in 1793; it did not, however, become an official American see until 1815.

[17] See Appendix E, Table A4.

[18] Ibid., Table A5.

[19] Ibid., Table A6.

[20] See chap. vi.

[21] Guilday, John Carroll, I, 310-305, gives brief biographical portraits of the American Jesuits. For the early history of these institutions see Joseph William Ruane, The Beginnings of the Society of St. Sulpice in the United States, 1791-1829 (Washington, D.C., 1935); John M. Daley, Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years (Washington, D.C., 1957).

[22] The "other" religious orders bishops had belonged to were: the Vincentians (C.M.), the Dominicans (O.P.), the Franciscans (O.S.F.), and the Friars Minor (O.F.M.).

[23] See chap. vii.

[24] Ibid.

[25] John Dubois to John Purcell, October 2, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky; John Tracy Ellis, The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America (Washington, D.C., 1946).

[26] Chap. vii explores other reasons for the relative decline in the elevation of regular clerics.

[27] Peter Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884 (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 100-163.

[28] Dubois to Purcell, October 2, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[29] See Appendix E, Table A7.

[30] Ambrose Maréchal, Benedict Flaget, Francis Kenrick, John Purcell, Martin Spalding, Michael O'Connor, and John David are a few examples of successful pastors and teachers who became administrators. Each continued his pastoral duties after assuming an administrative post. Bishop David had actually taught, directed a seminary, supervised a women's religious order, and acted as a pastor to laymen, all at the same time.

[31] Simon Bruté and David are only two examples of bishops who acted as "spiritual directors" of women's religious societies. Both supervised the Sisters of Charity, Emmitsburg, Maryland. David also established and directed the Nazareth, Kentucky branch of the same order, along with Flaget.

[32] Martin Spalding is an excellent example of a bright young cleric whom the bishops carefully prepared to be a future bishop-theologian. When Bishop Flaget, who along with David had taught Spalding, decided to send Spalding to the Urban College of the Propaganda in Rome for further theological training, he told Rome that Spalding had "acute intelligence," and "was able to learn all things." Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., 355r to v, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana.

[33] Bruté had been on the faculties of St. Mary's and the Mount and was Rector of both institutions; he was also a medical doctor. David had been successively a member of the faculty at Georgetown and at St. Mary's

XUM

and taught at Bardstown Seminary while acting as Superior of that School. Flaget had taught at Georgetown, St. Mary's, and the Mount before establishing, directing, and teaching in Bardstown Seminary. Maréchal had been a faculty member and President of St. Mary's. All these bishops had taught and administered educational institutions in Europe prior to emigrating. Maréchal was recalled to France for a time to teach and to direct Sulpician schools there. Francis Kenrick simultaneously taught at Bardstown Seminary and assisted Flaget and David in directing that school. O'Connor was both the Rector and a member of the faculty of St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Philadelphia. Before coming to America, O'Connor had been Vice-Rector of the Irish College, Rome, and on the faculty of the Urban College of Propaganda, Rome. While Purcell was a member of the faculty of St. Mary's, he began his tenure as President of the Mount. Spalding was President of the college affiliated with Bardstown Seminary and also taught courses at both schools. Although chosen by Rome, John England was definitely one of the leading bishop-theologians. He had been both a teacher at and the President of the College of St. Mary in Cork, Ireland.

[34] See Appendix E, Table A8.

[35] Ibid., Table A9.

[36] See chap. iv.

[37] Bishop Henry Conwell made this admission. Conwell to Leonard Neale, September 16, 1816, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland.

[38] See Appendix F, Table A10. Irishman John Clancy was the exception. In 1820 Rome had sent England to America to govern the newly erected See of Charleston, South Carolina. At England's request, Rome appointed Clancy Coadjutor of Charleston in 1834. Shunned by most of the bishops, who disapproved of England's independent action, Clancy became embittered and returned to Ireland in 1843.

[39] See Appendix F, Table A11.

[40] Ibid., Table A12.

XUM

[41] Ibid., Table A13.

[42] Ibid., Table A14.

[43] Two of the Roman appointees had been regular clerics, one a Dominican the other a Franciscan. If they are included, then the total number of regular bishops was actually twenty-five, or 41.7 per cent of a group of sixty. Aside from the nine Sulpicians and six Jesuits, four bishops had been Dominicans, four had been Vincentians, one a Franciscan, and one a Friar Minor.

[44] Mexican-born Francisco Garcia Diego y Moreno had worked in the Southwest for three years and Canadian-born Francis Blanchet and Modeste Demers in the Northwest for five and ten years, respectively.

[45] See Appendix F, Tables A15-A17.

[46] See chap. iv.

[47] See chap. v.

[48] Richard P. McCormick, The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era (Chapel Hill, 1966).

III. CHURCH-STATE PROBLEMATIC

The attitude of the American hierarchy concerning the church's relationship to the American Republic was complex, embodying at one and the same time a defense of Catholic sectarianism and a positive, creative, theological support of American pluralism. This was not a mindless or random development; influenced by their European backgrounds, the particular environment encountered in America, and the impact of changes in the European and American milieus, the bishops consciously, albeit often gropingly, came to grips with the way in which their peculiar institution could and should relate to the larger non-Catholic American society.

In Europe ecclesiastical institutions were limited by the necessity of remaining true to a commitment to a single and unified society and its one church. America offered organized religions a wide door to liberty. The Catholic hierarchy chose to open this door, moving from Bishop John Carroll's theological as well as practical statements to the theoretical arguments of Bishops Martin John Spalding, John England, and Michael O'Connor and to the prelates' joint pronouncement confining

XUM

Papal power to purely spiritual matters, made at their national meetings. Certainly political and religious pressures from Protestant America convinced the bishops they had to move in this direction. On the other hand, they wanted to do so; the New World bishops were American either by birth or training. And they could do so, because "separation of church and state" in America was a roughcast description of Constitutional polity, acceptable at least in practice to almost all Catholics, and the entire issue had not yet become entangled with European events and Roman responses to them.[1]

Sentiment favorable to defining a compatible relationship with the larger non-Catholic society antedated the official creation of an American hierarchy. Its origin lay in the relatively autonomous development of Catholicism in the Colonial period. Established primarily in Maryland in 1634 and administered almost entirely by Jesuit missionaries under the direction of their European superiors, Catholicism in the colonies knew only a tenuous bond to Rome.[2] Accounting in part for this situation was the mother country's physical distance from America. Itself undergoing continuous reorganization, the English church was not given official jurisdiction in the colonies until 1757. American Catholics had never really objected to the former

XUM

arrangement, managing to enjoy the best of both worlds under it. Theoretically they were orthodox, spiritually wedded to the Catholic mainstream through a traditional episcopacy. They were also assured of receiving all the Church sacraments, except holy orders and confirmation, since the leader of the American Jesuits was the vicar-general or official representative of the English hierarchy, charged with providing spiritual services to the colonial laity.[3] In practice, however, English bishops and even Rome more or less ignored the Americans, thereby allowing if not actually encouraging them to continue their relatively independent development. Naturally colonial Catholics were personally inclined toward such autonomy. In Maryland they had adopted one of the popular forms of Protestant church government--presbyterianism, characterized in part by legitimate lay involvement in spiritual as well as political decision-making. Certainly this was a response to a certain amount of non-Catholic sentiment, already well documented. Yet it also reflected the positive preference of a Catholic laity that was the social and cultural equal of its non-Catholic neighbors.

The first real threat to this independent development came eight years after the reorganization of 1757, when the English prelates asked to be relieved of their

XUM

colonial responsibility. Apparently they were convinced that their physical separation from America was too great and their acquisition of authority over the colonials had come too late for them to alter importantly the decidedly presbyterian coloration of American Catholicism. In its place, the English bishops suggested that Rome substitute an American hierarchy. If circumstances were unfavorable to the establishment of a regular American hierarchy with ordinary bishops, then, reasoned the English, Rome should at least arrange for an interim government by appointing a colonial Papal administrator or, in Catholic terminology, a vicar-apostolic.[4] What appeared to be a rather innocuous, perhaps even beneficial, plan to exchange a geographically distant source of authority for an American-based one had important political consequences. Establishment of a traditional episcopacy, either through an interim Papal administrator or ordinary bishops, offered the colonials ready access to all the Church sacraments. No longer would they have to travel to England or wait for an English bishop to come to America in order to receive holy orders and confirmation. Such a benefit was not taken lightly. Colonial Catholics were passionately committed to maintaining orthodoxy in their spiritual practices, as were their successors. (Indeed this probably was the most important reason why American bishops were eventually able to gain so much power over the life of the church.)

It was their personal distaste for, and immediate fear of, tightened external controls over the American clergy that temporarily outweighed this important consideration. Under no circumstances would the colonials accept a vicar-apostolic. They had intramural reasons for this. As part of the British system, Americans belonged to a national church that was directly responsible to the Pope. Under a vicar-apostolic they would be relegated to the status of a missionary church and subject to the authority of a foreign political power--the Roman Curia. Jesuit opposition was reinforced by the scars of European conflicts with the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. Generally called simply "Propaganda," it was created in 1622 to advise and guide Papal decisions for those areas Rome chose to classify as missions. Naturally it would be the Curia agency that appointed the vicar-apostolic, who in turn would be responsible solely to it for his activities. An interim government certainly would provide the perfect opportunity for Propaganda to appropriate American Jesuit property and gain mastery over the decision-making process, reasoned the clergy. The laity agreed.[5] Neither group stopped there.

Maryland laymen and their clerical compatriots were almost as strongly opposed to the creation of a regular American hierarchy. At first glance this appears unreasonable. They correctly assumed that Rome would most likely relegate them to a missionary status, meaning they would have to go through Propaganda to get the ear of the Pope. Aside from the fact that colonial Catholics refused to think of themselves as missionaries and therefore considered such an arrangement improper, if they had their own hierarchy they could bargain with Propaganda as equals.[6] The bishops would be appointed for life, unlike a vicar-apostolic who would hold power only at the pleasure of Propaganda. Of course, should Rome decide to appoint "foreigners" as American bishops, the national Catholic churches they had been recruited from might gain an undue influence over the affairs of the American church through these men. Instead of one potential source of foreign domination--Rome--American Catholics might have to contend with several competing sources. This was an important, but as time would show, certainly not insurmountable consideration. Without discounting issues of status, "foreign" bishops, and the lingering Jesuit fear of losing its real estate, if handled correctly an episcopal system could foster a church that was politically and socially American while spiritually Roman. Why then oppose it?

Colonial Catholics were Americans. Families like the Carrolls, Brents, and Neales had been in the colonies since 1634; from this perspective they understood, appreciated, and even supported general colonial developments. Certainly their resistance to the interim government plan had been flavored by issues other than their own preference for the autonomy to which they had become so accustomed. Obviously it would have been incongruous for Catholics to allow Rome to gain a political foothold in the colonies at the same time that some of them were supporting non-Catholic resistance to a tightening of British imperial controls.[7] Colonial politics, surfacing as part of the reason Catholics were against the interim plan, became the primary focus of their opposition to the creation of a regular episcopal government. If proposals to extend the Anglican hierarchy were engendering such tremendous hostility in America, how could Catholics, whose religious status was much less secure, even dare to suggest an episcopacy?[8] This is what 265 Maryland laymen told the European church authorities. In a memorandum of July 11, 1765 they pointed out that

> neither this province, nor indeed any one of the British American colonies has ever hitherto had one of that Ecclesiastical rank & dignity. Would not our setting the 1st. example of that kind appear very bold & presuming, if not also even dareing and insulting?[9]

They concluded with a warning that an American hierarchy

> would necessarily draw after it the utter destruction & extirpation of our H[oly] religion out of this colony, & consequently compel us either to forefeit a great part of our estates & fortunes in order to retreat to another country, or utterly give up the exercise of our H[oly] religion.[10]

This was apparently a convincing argument. Rome denied the English recommendation. English jurisdiction thus continued, with one important difference. English bishops no longer even bothered trying to govern colonial Catholics.

With historical hindsight it might be argued that at its peril Rome ignored the first real hint that Americans were creating a system that if unchecked might result in a separate or at least distinctive Catholic communion. But this is overstating the case. After all, English prelates were responding more to immediate practical exigencies than future political considerations; colonial Catholics had given no real indication that they intended to institutionalize their rather haphazard development; and Rome was immersed in the problems antecedent to the French Revolutionary era in Europe.

More certain was the desire of colonial Catholics to be *pari passu* spiritually united to Rome and socially and politically American. In asserting this posture they actually set the theme for future American Catholic relations with the new Republic and with Rome.

Institutionalization of this distinctive vision began after the War for Independence had made absolutely necessary the creation of an American hierarchy. With the outbreak of the Revolution, Rome reconsidered the idea of appointing a vicar-apostolic to replace the English jurisdiction the war had effectively ended. Actually it was not until 1781 that London's Bishop John Talbot flatly refused to continue even his nominal jurisdiction over the American church. He also rescinded the delegated authority that his predecessor in 1757 had granted to the head of the American Jesuit missionaries, whose order had been suppressed everywhere except in Russia in 1773.[11] But the American clergy had other ideas. Led by future Bishop John Carroll, they adopted in 1782 and began at once to put into effect a plan for church government that was clearly nationalistic. Its principal aim was to keep Rome from gaining political control over the new nation's Catholics. While governing the church in three general as well as a number of separate district meetings, the Select Body of the

Clergy--as the organized ex-Jesuit priests called themselves--informed Rome that neither American Catholics nor their civil government would tolerate the appointment of a vicar-apostolic holding office at the pleasure of a foreign tribunal.[12] As Select Body spokesman Carroll told one of his favorite English correspondents, Charles Plowden, in 1784, "this you may be assured of, that no authority derived from the Propaganda will ever be admitted here." Like the colonials, Carroll distinguished proper Papal spiritual authority from improper Roman political power:

> The Catholic Clergy and Laity here know that the only connection they ought to have with Rome is to acknowledge the Pope as Spiritual head of the Church; that no Congregation existing in his States shall be allowed to exercise any share of his Spiritual authority here.

Then Carroll told his friend about the non-episcopal government the ex-Jesuits had set up. "Our Brethren here," he said, ". . . settled . . . a plan of internal government, which will meet with your approbation, being founded on Christian and rational principles."[13] While Plowden, himself an ex-Jesuit, may have approved of such a "Christian and rational" polity, Rome certainly did not.

Two months later Rome took the first step to stop this development toward a non-ecclesiastical national institution. On June 9, 1784, Rome made Carroll ecclesiastical superior of the "Mission in the thirteen United States of North America," informing him of its intention to follow this by appointment of a vicar-apostolic.[14] Clearly determined to give American Catholics a proper ecclesiastical structure, Rome had again posed the threat of a political relationship. The effect was to convince even the most stalwart no-episcopacy--interim or regular--faction among American Catholics to reconsider. Leonard Neale, one of the ex-Jesuit leaders of this faction, reluctantly came to accept Carroll's argument that only a regular American hierarchy could assure a non-political or purely spiritual Roman-American relationship.[15] Writing to Carroll, Neale said:

> I cannot help thinking . . . that the Propag[an]da really intends nothing less than establishing its internal influence in this part of the world: Indeed I never thought otherwise & further, I cannot help thinking with you that the S[acre]d Cong[regati]on ought to be effectually check'd in its scheming drift, & very probably the means [that is, a regular American hierarchy] you propose may be the most effectual & proper in order to [provide] this check.[16]

If Catholics in the United States were to enjoy a traditional ecclesiastical structure, it would have to be governed by a national hierarchy, "in whose appointment," said Carroll, the Curia should "have no share," so as to make Americans "very easy about [its] machinations."[17]

Anxious to settle the situation, Rome accepted Carroll's proposition. In 1789 the Holy See decided to create an American hierarchy, with bishops enjoying lifetime tenure, rather than to appoint a Papal administrator or vicar-apostolic, whose service would be at the pleasure of the Curia. The Pope did insist, however, on conducting official business with the American church through Propaganda. But the Select Body of the Clergy was allowed to nominate and by that means effectively select from among its membership a candidate for bishop, because unlike European civil authorities the United States government could not and would not do so.[18] John Carroll was nominated at once to be Bishop of Baltimore. Unwittingly Rome had established a self-selection privilege that American bishops would come to insist upon almost as a right. Of course, Rome made these arrangements at a time when the European church was being forced to assume a defensive posture. On the other hand, these decisions also stemmed from the unique political and social situation in the United States, which Rome neither understood nor took time to examine.

Bishop Carroll added a theoretical dimension to the church-state problematic. Indeed, his concern with how the Church should relate to the new Republic was forced upon him, as it had been earlier upon the colonial clergy, by Protestant charges that the Catholic Church was incompatible with American precepts. After the Revolution but before Carroll's selection as bishop, a handful of letters and articles objecting to religious liberty for Catholics appeared in a Philadelphia magazine, the Columbian, and in a New York newspaper, the United States Gazette.[19] Adopting the name Pacificus and a style analogous to the one his kinsman Charles Carroll of Carrollton ("First Citizen") had used in a famous pre-revolutionary debate with Daniel Dulany, Carroll gladly joined such famous noms de plume as Cassius, Fabius, Agrippa, Cato, Brutus, and Publius in their voluminous journalistic essays addressed to the issue of defining more carefully the dimensions of freedom under the federal system.[20] Distinctly an American of the Maryland genre, Carroll wrote in a comfortable vain, his arguments precise, based upon constitutionalism and justice. When his antagonists argued that the United States had been founded to preserve Protestantism, Carroll answered that the United States had to place the preservation of its liberties and government on the attachment of mankind to political happiness and security of its persons and property, which were "independent of any religious doctrines and not restrained by any."[21] While John Carroll clarified the Catholic position in a battle of broadsides, his brother, Daniel, helped shape the actual amendment to the Constitution that in 1791 prohibited Congress from making any law respecting an establishment of religion.[22]

The most serious attack, however, came from within the American Catholic church. Many attacks by non-Catholics Carroll easily refuted as misunderstandings of the meaning of religious freedom, since more likely than not they were sectarian defenses. Quite the contrary with intramural criticism, especially when it was a sophisticated theological presentation from the pen of an educated and respected priest like the Reverend Charles Henry Wharton. Wharton was a Maryland priest some dozen years younger than John Carroll, to whom he was distantly related. Like Carroll, Wharton had been educated at St. Omer, Liège, and Bruges and had entered the Society of Jesus. Unlike his relative, Wharton chose to go to England rather than return to Maryland when the Jesuits were suppressed in 1773. After four years there he became chaplain to the Catholics of Worcester. During the Revolution the chaplain publicly sympathized with the

Maryland patriots, deciding to return when peace came in 1783.[23]

Rumors that Wharton was thinking about abandoning his faith before leaving England preceeded his American arrival.[24] Within a few months Wharton confirmed his colleagues' suspicions, announcing in Philadelphia that his Catholicism was at an end. Apostasy was bad enough; published announcement and defense of it in a tone of courteous regret, beginning with a paraphrase of the preamble of the American Declaration of Independence, was devastating. In a pamphlet entitled _The Letter to the Roman Catholics of the City of Worcester_, Wharton argued that his step symbolized an enlargement of ideas, a throwing off of shackles. With scholarly references to Church authors not readily available in the United States, he attacked various Catholic doctrines. The net result was a vindication of Protestant charges that by countenancing political intervention in civil affairs and supporting the doctrine of the necessity of the Church to salvation, the Roman Church was incompatible with America's developing twin ideals of religious freedom and separation of church and state. With this Wharton precipitated a controversy that reverberated throughout the Western Catholic world. His _Letter_ was published in both Europe and America.[25]

It became Carroll's task to write the refutation. If undisputed the Letter could reinforce both the suspicions of American and European non-Catholics and unorthodox tendencies of Catholics living in the United States. Besides, some American and English ex-Jesuits were convinced that Wharton had misinterpreted Catholic theologians like Robert Cardinal Ballarmine (1542-1621) and the conciliar history of the Church. While the Select Body of the Clergy voted to pay the expenses of printing the refutation in England and America, Carroll carefully selected a library for his research that contained those books Wharton had used. So it was at Annapolis, Maryland, that Carroll spent almost an entire summer drafting his reply--An Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America.[26]

The arguments Carroll made on such issues as Papal infallibility will be discussed later. For now we shall pause to observe only the important impact Carroll's research had on the way in which he began the process of hammering out a church-state theory, the devising of which, incidentally, has been generally attributed to American theologians of the second half of the twentieth century. Joseph Berington, the new bishop's former English colleague, had urged Carroll to take advantage of the religious situation in America to bring Catholic thinking on the prerogatives of the See of Rome back to what was essential. "Shut your eyes on the 14 last centuries," Berington advised, "and only consider what was the prerogative of the See of Rome during the Apostolic ages and the years immediately succeeding to them. All that is essential then existed. . . . " Berington thought the Catholic understanding of the intrinsic dependence of the civil upon the spiritual authority an "abuse and usurpation."[27]

Agreeing with his friend, Carroll began by accepting Bellarmine's notion that in a republican form of government, where power is derived from the consent of the people and not from natural law, spiritual authority can be direct only over the realm of the spiritual--that is, over the consciences of the people.[28] But Bellarmine had added the qualification that in exceptional cases, whenever a temporal affair raises a moral issue and engages the spiritual order, the Church could exert its spiritual power over the temporal order, even if the civil authority was a republican state.[29] Carroll did not develop a systematic defense against this qualification. In private statements to former English colleagues, the refutation of Wharton's Letter, and other public declarations to Americans, however, he seemed to hold that Bellarmine's "exceptional cases" represented Catholicism's accommodation to the historical development of European church-state relationships in confessional nations committed to the medieval ideal of a society unified around a single Church.[30] An element of historical relativity was therefore introduced into what had become an absolutely dogmatic church-state relationship.

Carroll, in harmony with Berington, believed the American Republic was a new political category that offered the Papacy an opportunity to return to its original confinement to purely spiritual prerogatives.[31] Behind this belief lurked a desire to vindicate to the Church, not just to non-Catholics, its true mission. If Carroll could prove that such a mission was not only possible but actually protected in a democratic republic, then the Church would be forced to accept and even to support the American polity as the best possible system within which to propagate its own ideals.

Carroll clearly stated this belief in his pastoral letter of February 22, 1797, which anticipated the more systematic thinking on this same issue by such twentieth-century American Catholic theologians as John Courtney Murray. According to Murray, the First Amendment to the United States Constitution underlines the distinction between man as a citizen and man as religious being, while recognizing the primacy of the spiritual. Although

XUM

the state holds coercive power over the "lay" or civil life of its citizens, it has no authority over their religious lives. In spiritual matters, Murray observed, the Constitution respects the authority inherent in the consciences of its citizens. Claiming neither religious knowledge nor ignorance, the state "simply maintains reverence for knowledge or ignorance as these are present in its citizens."[32]

Carroll's pastoral was based on these same assumptions. In America, he said, the state's prerogative was to "command and enforce by outward coercion, the services which tend to the preservation and defense of that personal security, and of that property, for the sake of which political societies were formed, and men agreed to live under the protection of, and in obedience to civil government." The Pope's prerogative was to watch over the integrity and soundness of the religious knowledge of those American citizens who were Catholics. But in enforcing the duties of religion, securing purity of worship, and maintaining ecclesiastical discipline, the Pope was limited to the spiritual power of persuasion. He could not, Carroll noted, depend upon the coercive power of the state.[33] "In these United States our religious system has undergone a revolution, if possible, more extraordinary than our political one," he wrote.[34]

Because he understood the theoretical and practical implications of the new Republic's proclamation of religious freedom, Carroll knew American Catholics could not, and he believed they should not, hope their state would tolerate any foreign jurisdiction over them beyond that essential to their religion, namely the spiritual power of the Roman Papacy.[35]

Spiritual unity with Rome was imperative. At times Carroll referred to American Catholicism as a "national" church. He desired an American-trained clergy and hierarchy, initially opposing study in Rome for aspirants to the priesthood. He favored the use of the vernacular in the liturgy. He suggested that lay Catholics be sent to secular colleges.[36] At the same time he worried that the very conditions he was trying to create--America's political distance from Rome and a national clergy without European ties--threatened even a spiritual bond with Rome.[37] And if the influence of French Enlightenment philosophy in America resulted in the replacement of the new Republic's Constitutional axioms (religious liberty and separation of church and state) with French ones (laicization and dechristianization), then American Catholics would almost certainly splinter off from the spiritual center of Roman Catholicism, as their French co-religionists had done.[38]

Coupled with Carroll's social and political proclivities, these concerns made him a staunch Federalist. Delighted with the election of George Washington, who exhibited different "principles of the necessity of religion than the French Theorists on Government," Carroll was vexed when "several . . . whose political sentiments were known to militate against the Constitution" wore badges hypocritically mourning Washington's death.[39] On both these occasions the bishop praised the relationship between religion and the commonweal assumed by Washington and like-minded men of the American Enlightenment; all religions served equally well and therefore must be equally protected as inculcators of a necessary common morality within the new nation.[40] At his inauguration in 1789, Carroll said, Washington encouraged "respect for religion and inculcate[d] by words and actions, that principle on which the welfare of nations so much depends, that a superintending Providence governs the events of the world, and watches over the conduct of men."[41]

Certainly the first bishop charged his church to be socially and politically American while spiritually Roman. Perhaps this was idealistic. Surely it was complex and maybe even impossible to realize, especially as the laity became increasingly ethno-culturally diverse.

Rome never understood it, conditioned as it quite naturally was by European social and political developments, especially the French Revolution. American Catholics probably never knew it, with exceptions like the Maryland elite and converts like Orestes Brownson and Issac Hecker. It is about time, however, to examine the thoughts and actions of the American Catholic leadership separate from those of the European church and the American laity.

Carroll's associates and successors in the American hierarchy continued to study and debate the prerogatives of Rome in relation to the young Republic. Collectively they agreed on the validity of specific points: freedom of conscience, distinction between the spiritual and temporal, and American constitutionalism. Individually, these men differed in their understanding of pluralism and the degree to which they could accept the practical implications of such a system, not so much the theological.

Most bishops were concerned with the practical legal guarantee of religious freedom for the development of their particular denomination. Of course, this was an immediate concern; they had to organize a viable institution in a climate where religious freedom was a federally mandated Constitutional fact but not yet a social reality. The state of Massachusetts, for example, required public officials to take an "oath of abjuration" disclaiming the spiritual jurisdiction of any foreign prelate. During the revision of that constitution in favor of religious freedom, French-born Bishop John Cheverus of Boston advised one of the convention delegates that "the oath of office (by which every spiritual jurisdiction of any foreign Prelate is disclaimed) is the only thing to which we [Catholics] object in the Constitution." Cheverus went further; he enclosed an article on the positive theoretical necessity of religious freedom as a statement of the principles he held:

> It is not easy to imagine what fair objections can be made to the tenet of the Catholic Church which requires its priests to correspond with a venerable Prelate in another country. . . . There is no tenet in the Catholic Church by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with those of other denominations or those who differ from them in matters of religion. . . . All these tests [such as the oath of abjuration] are equally vain and fruitless, whether the truth be with the Catholics or not--in the words of Lord Mansfield, 'Conscience is not controllable by human laws, nor amenable to human tribunals.' Persecution, or attempts to force conscience, will never produce conviction, and are only calculated to make either hypocrites or martyrs.[42]

Urged by family and friends to return to France, Cheverus said no. He preferred the religious climate of America to that of France, where the church was dependent upon and frequently servile to civil power.[43]

The bishops' entanglement with the school issue in the 1840's was another example of their ongoing quest for gaining and maintaining the Constitutional guarantee that religious freedom gave them to define their own island of meaning in a pluralistic society. Emphatically, all prelates agreed that the Catholic right to educate in a climate of effective liberty was necessary to the development of their own religious denomination. Furthermore, they thought it essential to the life of the Commonwealth. In this context, the church-state problematic quite naturally was affected by the issue of the practical legal guarantee of religious liberty. Fought out in civil courts, state legislatures, and newspapers, the education question also became highly visible.

Bishop John Hughes triggered the first major episode in what has become the perennial "school question," when he sought public funds for Catholic education in New York City. The ensuing dispute resulted in defeat of the Protestant Public School Society's monopoly over education in that city, but denial also of Hughes's proposal. It was not an isolated incident. Archbishop Anthony Blanc of New Orleans and other members of the hierarchy likewise tried to procure public funds for parochial schools.[44] Naturally, all bishops urged the

XUM

development of Catholic schools, using their national meeting in 1852 (the First Plenary Council) as a proper forum to issue a collective warning against "those who would persuade you [communicants] that religion can be separated from secular instruction."[45]

None of them, however, went so far as Hughes, who declared the "common school sect" to be "anything, everything, except religionism and patriotism."[46] But then none ever was in the same kind of situation as Hughes, who uttered these inflammatory words in the heat of the New York political conflagration. Considering individual attempts to follow Hughes's example, although on a much smaller scale, with the concerted statement of 1852 does lend credence to the view that the hierarchy saw religious liberty as a practical legal guarantee with an essentially individual thrust. On the other hand, accepting such self-serving concerns as significant clearly does not therefore mean they exclusively delimited the bishops' understanding of or support for American political precepts and practices.

The hierarchy's insistence on its Constitutionally guaranteed right to maintain a traditional Catholic ecclesiastical polity--so long as it owed no political loyalty to external powers--probably had a more dramatic effect on defining the relationship between the church and the larger non-Catholic society than any other issue. On the other hand, whether and to what extent the locus of power should be in a body of bishops was the greatest source of conflict within the church itself. Some American Catholics joined non-Catholics in recognizing an awkward dichotomy between the location of religious authority in a body of bishops and the immediacy of religious truth, questioning the appropriateness of traditional Catholic government in a democratic society. Simultaneously the laws of the new nation supported the Catholic predilection for presbyterian polity (in Catholic terminology, lay trusteeism). Elected by pewholders, lay trustees were supposed to administer the nonspiritual affairs of their congregations, leaving spiritual matters--especially appointments and dismissals of priests--to the bishops. In practice, however, the system was being translated into a program of action against episcopacy. How the bishops dealt with this problem is examined in another section. For now it is sufficient to say that in the larger perspective the bishops tried desperately to find some happy medium between Roman ecclesiastical and Anglo-American presbyterian polities.

Ultimately, the bishops consolidated their power in a distinctively American way. They came to discard the practical and to deny the theoretical claims of Catholicism to a single and unified society and its one Church. Although hierarchical disagreement over the way in which to organize their own church will be discussed later, it might be said here that the prelates' emphasis on and preference for persuasive rather than coercive measures, coupled with their demographic characteristics, indicates that their quest for power was also a consciously positive search for legitimation within a political framework new to the history of Western Christendom.

Actually these American bishops forged ahead with great enthusiasm and almost embarrassing optimism--hardly signs of a defensive, isolated, cynical leadership. They paraded through the streets of Baltimore in full ceremonial regalia, blessing the spectators with incense, before each of their seven national meetings held between 1829 and 1849. They built large churches in prominent locations in major cities that would, in the words of John Hughes, "expose the Godly Presbyterian to the danger of squinting in his effort to look the other way as he passes." They sponsored a very successful religious jubilee from 1825 through 1827, analogous in some ways to the Protestant evangelical revivals. They invited prominent politicians and leaders of

Protestant denominations to support these activities by their presence and with their money.[47]

Even the anti-Catholic sentiment of the thirties and forties failed to dampen this open and unapologetic movement toward denominational success. Only once did the bishops speak collectively and therefore officially on the issue of anti-Catholicism. In the Pastoral Letter to the clergy and laity, issued on April 22, 1837, they expressed themselves "painfully constrained to notice the misrepresentation and persecution," especially the 1834 burning of the convent of the Ursuline Sisters at Charlestown, Massachusetts, that had marked the years since their last national meeting in 1833. Anti-Catholicism, the bishops boldly said, meant anti-Christianity.[48] Individually these men in their correspondence with each other and Rome never expressed a sense of oppression or fear. Typifying his colleagues' sentiments, Francis Kenrick believed the bishops would just have to see to it that their priests received the kind of education they needed to compete more successfully with their Protestant counterparts for American "souls."[49] Cleverly the prelates used signs of anti-Catholicism for leverage in their battle with Rome to win the privilege of selecting their own colleagues. Americans would never accept "foreigners" as leaders, they argued. Certainly governors of the nation's institutions could be born in Europe, but they had to be trained and seasoned in the United States.[50] There can be little doubt that in the first half of the nineteenth century Catholic bishops willingly participated in ushering in the national religious phenomenon of the second half of that century, which historian Sidney E. Mead has aptly referred to as the success story of the free churches.[51]

At the same time the bishops continued to examine the theoretical relationship between American pluralism and Roman Catholicism that Carroll had begun. A long and sophisticated dialogue among French-born Bishops Simon Bruté, John David, and Benedict Flaget and between them and Irish-born Bishop John England and North Carolina Supreme Court Justice William Gaston (a Catholic layman) helped clarify some of the issues. Bruté, David, and Flaget ardently followed religious developments in their native country. When Bruté was teaching philosophy at St. Mary's Seminary in Maryland, he introduced Flaget and David to the work of his personal friend and French theologian, Félicité Robert de Lamennais.[52] Often corresponding with each other about their mutual concern over the social disorder and "irreligion" of France, the three prelates embraced Lamennais's pre-1829 writings, because--

as David put it--"God breathed on him [Lamennais] in order to maintain His church and the defense of the Catholic state in France."[53] In these works Lamennais denounced Gallicanism, a term derived from a seventeenth-century religious movement in France and used to describe any desire for a national church to stand virtually independent of the Holy See. Opposing French democracy, he affirmed the supremacy of the Pope as the unique source of order in society, and called for reestablishment of the principles of the ancien régime (that is, a single and unified society and its one Church).[54]

Flaget found the works of this "savant" to be "sugar and honey." They were "almost the only books [I] read from the beginning to the end."[55] David discovered "our logical ideas on the principles of instinctive evidence" as the source of religious certitude to be "somewhat disturbed" by Lamennais's sensus communis theory--religious certitude is grounded in the general reason of the human race. Prior to accepting Lamennais's theory, David had "viewed that each man was infallible"; but he "could clearly see now that each man, isolated from the rest of man, that is, each particular reason isolated from other reasons, remains subject to error."[56] As superior of the diocesan seminary of Bardstown, David told Flaget he wanted to have "the logic taken from that basis formed on the principles developed in the works of that excellent author Lamennais" taught in the seminary. In reply, Flaget assured David that he had already written to Lamennais, requesting more information on this logic. David, in the meantime, had discovered that a disciple of Lamennais had put the scholar's ideas into the form of a catechism, which was the "very idea of Flaget." David suggested using that catechism, especially if it were translated into English.[57]

From the publication in 1817 of the first of his four-volume Essai sur l'indifference en matérie de religion to the publication in 1826 of De la religion considérée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil, Lamennais's philosophical system was bound up with his monarchical political theory, which, in turn, reflected the course of religious developments in post-Revolutionary France. Correctly assuming that in France, Gallicanism had subjected the church to the authority of a "democratic" state that had laicized or dechristianized the country, his panacea was a return to the ordered principles of the pre-Revolutionary era.[58] By 1829, however, affected by the apparent compatibility of political liberalism and Catholicism in other European countries, especially Belgium, associating this compatibility with his sensu communis idea, and offended by the

XUM

new French ordinance establishing state control of secondary education, Lamennais began to differentiate between dogmatic and "true" liberalism. He argued that the element of truth--"the existence of a common, immutable universal law of justice and truth obligatory for each man"--had been denied by the forces of dogmatic liberalism. Within the liberal camp, therefore, he distinguished the nefarious remnant of French Jacobinism, on the one hand, and those men, on the other hand, who struggle for and support the "true" liberal cause.[59] Lamennais joined the "true" liberal revolutionaries of 1830, using their organ--*L'Avenir*--to theologize a liberal concept of church and state that would take the official Church more than a century to acknowledge as ideologically acceptable rather than merely tolerable.

Sharing his compatriot's concern with religion in France, Bruté ostensibly understood and accepted Lamennais's pre-1829 church-state position. In a three-cornered correspondence between himself, Bishop John England, and Judge William Gaston, Bruté questioned the efficacy of democracy. He was convinced that "only half known to the whole" of those French, who, talking of "imitating the system in America," led France into revolution, was the "United States Constitution."[60] To say that "rivers of blood and years of desolation" might be

XUM

necessary for France to have the liberty of America, Thomas Jefferson was a "fanatical philosopher." A "French United States" was only a dream.[61] Bruté doubted that the 1830 liberals were any "truer" than their 1789 predecessors. "Now [in the 1830's] as in 1789" there was an "overthrow of . . . rule . . . not for the principle substitution of any given system, but merely as in 1789 an overthrow of what existed to begin experiment and a trial of strength . . . amidst quite different parties!"[62] Admiring America because it was "such a practical case of sincere choice," Bruté was acutely aware of the distance between democratic theory and practice.[63] Reading "those strange and humbling bills of Maryland and Virginia" respecting enforced colonization of freed slaves, Bruté sadly considered the limitations of American freedom. "What now of all those principles assumed for the main ground of merit of the great liberators and Vindicators of the first and inalienable right of man, Liberty?" Liberty was yet an "undefined" and ineffective "assertion."[64]

An admirer of Bruté's theological acumen, who once described him as "the best of men," England thought Bruté had an imperfect understanding of American axioms and a perfect attachment to the principles of the ancien régime.[65] England clarified his position and correctly diagnosed Bruté's state of mind in a letter to his French friend:

> You [Bruté] appear to make great mistakes of my sentiments, when you imagine me favorable to the infidel school of France and an admission of their revolutionary projects--you do not condemn them more than I do. But you run, and I can not blame you for it, to the extreme of attachment to all the ancient régime. I respect those who do--but I differ from their views and opinions--though I unsparingly condemn their raucous and irreligious enemies. I am attached to the American Constitution, but I am not blind to its great imperfections, nor am I reckless of the inordinate ambition and gross corruption which I fear will at an early period produce its ruin. I do not think our confederation is likely to last a great many centuries. But my duty is whilst I live under it to live according to its principles.[66]

Bruté, despite his friend's instruction, rejected Lamennais's post-1829 theological position on the relationship of the church to the state, because he doubted that nations or people could "really govern themselves" until the "real corruption of mankind [is] mended."[67] Until this occurred, the best order of society was a monarchy, with the temporal power subordinate to the spiritual power. It was the responsibility of the spiritual authority--the Catholic Church--to decide the great problems of social justice and the questions of divine law. Exercising its spiritual power, the Church disclaimed possessing temporal authority, rather it was deciding questions that were related to divine law.

The implication was that American axioms are a tolerable hypothesis.

Flaget and David probably had a less adequate comprehension of Lamennais's ideas. Besides, Flaget was more interested in the affairs of his diocese--"construction of buildings and purchasing land"--than in lofty and scholarly theological dispute.[68] David, although solidly grounded in theology, kept busy administering and teaching in the Bardstown Seminary. He also wrote a number of tracts explaining and defending Catholic forms of religious practice. And he was responsible for the popular Bardstown Catechism, which American bishops adopted for use in their dioceses throughout the country.[69] David received a letter from Bruté chastising him for continuing to admire and accept Lamennais's principles, when Rome, after all, was undecided. In reply, David confessed that he failed to "disabuse himself" of feelings of "esteem and friendship" for Lamennais, and found the theologian's great enthusiasm for liberty, while "scarcely proper" for France, "fitted for the United States." Perhaps some readers misunderstood Lamennais? Whatever, David in the end agreed that Lamennais, who had gone to Rome to defend his principles, should submit to the dictates of the Holy See.[70]

Also important in the continuing theological debate was a less consciously articulate and rather simplistic admiration of American and post-1830 French Republicanism among prelates of varied national backgrounds. Following Lamennais's liberal conversion, Bishop Peter Loras confided in his colleague Anthony Blanc that he was "a bit of a Republican."[71] Blanc and the Bishop of Mobile, Michael Portier, discussed American and French Republicanism, both men having "faith" in such a system.[72] On the other hand, American-born Bishop John Chanche of Natchez thought it was somewhat "droll to see [French prelates] writing about the happy government of the United States and lauding the labouring classes."[73] With the exception, however, of Bruté, a "conservative," and Flaget and David, it is difficult to measure the extent to which the other French-born bishops were cognizant of and committed to the developing European liberal position on the church-state problematic. Some of them did educate, admire, and work with those members of the hierarchy who were defining and supporting an American liberal theory on the relationship of the Catholic Church to their democratic state. Bruté's former student and colleague, Bishop John Purcell, opposed the Pope's 1832 position against liberty of conscience.[74] Along with Bishop Francis Kenrick, who

XUM

believed that secular concerns were not subject to the Pope's cognizance, and John England, Purcell urged the liberal theologian Michael O'Connor to come to America, eventually proposing him for membership in the hierarchy.[75] Before becoming Bishop of Philadelphia and subsequently sixth Archbishop of Baltimore, Francis Kenrick was on the faculty of Bardstown Seminary, where he began to develop his reputation as one of the most respected nineteenth-century American theologians.[76] At Bardstown he joined David and Flaget in producing future distinguished members of the hierarchy like Martin John Spalding.[77]

England, Kenrick, O'Connor, and Spalding, joined by John Fitzgerald, were a close-knit group of bishop-theologians. It was their developing convictions that contributed a special impetus to the systematic and distinctively American church-state theology. Their views affected and in turn were influenced by the French-born bishops and others of less intellectual stature, and by the seminarians they taught.[78] In their attempts to hammer out a functioning tradition of church-state relations, these men were above all sensitive to history, like Carroll before them. The five differentiated between what they took to be the essential prerogatives of the Holy See and those that were mere accidents of history. In an outline for a lecture on the "Influence of the Papacy on Civil Liberty," Spalding wrote that the Pope's powers "are wholly spiritual--he has no temporal power. . . . All Catholics believe this." Historical exigencies had forced the Papacy to get involved in civil affairs.

> You will tell me that temporal power was claimed and exercised by the Pope's for 500 years in [the] dark ages--well, granted: it was no doctrine of the Church, nowhere defined & could nowhere [be] defined. . . . It was a mere accident of the papacy, not belonging to the substances--an appendage not the thing itself--papacy had existed hundreds of years both before and afterwards.[79]

While Spalding was yet a student, John England was already writing on the church-state problematic. England was one of the Irish-born and -trained bishops who had been appointed to the American hierarchy by Rome. Nevertheless, he was an admired associate of the Bardstown faction--Bruté, Flaget, David, and later Purcell and Joseph Rosati.[80] England, in common with Bruté, Flaget, and David, was definitely influenced by and very concerned with developments in his own native country, having been a youthful leader of Irish emancipation. A prolific writer and committed to the idea that the United States, notwithstanding its Protestant abberations, was seeking to perfect a moral order to which

Catholicism could mightily contribute and of which Catholicism was, in reality, the highest religious expression, his public image tended to overshadow that of his fellow bishop-theologians. To England, America was not a Protestant country but a "mixed community, a country of no distinct religious denomination, but one of perfect freedom, and of a vast variety of religious opinions; one whose inhabitants have solemnly interdicted to its government any interference, direct or indirect, with the subject of their religion."[81] In America, the "obligation of keeping faith [is] grounded on the law of nature, which binds all men equally, without respect for their religious opinions"; and with regard to Catholics, it was still more cogent, as it was "confirmed by the principles of their religion."[82]

One of the most important questions respecting the future discipline of the church as well as its relationship to political power was, for England, the mode of providing and securing funds for the support of the church. On the defensive, he accused European governments of offering financial support to the Church, because they "want the right to interfere with its discipline." Without balancing the "good" and "evils" of state support in detail, he preferred "infinitely more, Church liberty and poverty to subjugation accompanied by the most splendid endowments."[83] Denying the legitimacy of tax funds for any religious agency, he saw the duty of the Catholic legislator as "regulated by the power which is conferred upon him . . . to legislate only for the temporal welfare of the state, not upon the religious concerns of the people. . . . It would on his part be a usurpation . . . to use his power openly or covertly for the checking of heresy or the elevation of his own Church."[84] In all forms of society but especially in a democracy the church should depend upon the "zeal of the people" for its support.[85]

Moving from constitutionalism to the theory of the spiritual and temporal, England was faced with the reality of the Pope's temporal kingdom in Italy. But he denied that this political dominion in any way related to the Pope's spiritual quality. When Popes deposed princes, this was done "not by divine right but by the confession and grant of the nations and the kings themselves, deliberately given in congress. Those persons were not deposed by the Pope because of their excommunication, nor because of their defection from the faith, but because of the regulation of the congress which empowered him to execute the law which it had made."[86] He added that "the popes never possessed any plenary power, spiritual or temporal, to depose princes;

the source of temporal power, the people, is entirely distinct from the source of the pope's spiritual authority." Since this is so, the Pope's total spiritual authority in the Church cannot be objected to. Excommunication has no civil consequences: "The Pope's authority is merely of a spiritual nature and can never interfere with the temporal authority of our government."[87] Any "civil authority, power, jurisdiction or preeminence, directly or indirectly," in a civil kingdom or province is also denied to the "cardinals" and "even [to] a general council."[88] Nothing said by any Catholic authority on "civil or political regulations" has the slightest binding force for Catholics, added England. Such an action was forbidden by natural law.[89]

John Hughes, Irish-born but trained in America by Bruté and Purcell, agreed with England. Delivering a speech on "Irish Emancipation," he told his audience that when Popes had interfered with the government of kingdoms, "kings and nations had invoked that interference." Popes had no rights, "feudal or otherwise," over civil government. In those civil acts in which Popes had been involved they "did not derive their authority from the papacy." Since Papal interference in temporal affairs was not a function of natural law, Hughes suggested that the source of such intervention was to be found in historical exigencies. We should examine such actions "in connection with the times in which they occurred, the co-temporaneous prejudices, the nature of governments, [and] the manners and general condition of society when they happened. . . ."[90]

All bishop-theologians agreed; grants of nations and kings rather than any principle of divine right were responsible for the "accident" of Papal temporal power. The United States Constitution, they believed, negated such grants, while on the other hand it had "solemnly interdicted to its government any interference, direct or indirect, with the subject of religion."[91] And certainly, commented Spalding,

> the analogy of the Church's principles with those embodied in our Declaration of Independence, must be manifest to every reflecting mind, while their influence on the social conditions could not be otherwise than favorable to the development of free principles, as well as destructive of tyranny.[92]

The American state then was a new political event, offering the Roman Catholic Church an opportunity to discard the notion of Papal temporal power and recapture its ideal of a purely spiritual mission.

The hierarchy officially supported its theologians by issuing a statement proclaiming that its allegiance to the Holy See was spiritual, not political. When, the bishops declared,

> using our undoubted right, we acknowledge the spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy of the chief bishop of our universal church, the Pope or bishop of Rome, we do not thereby forfeit our claim to the civil and political protection of the commonwealth; for, we do not detract from the allegiance to which the temporal governments are plainly entitled, and which we cheerfully give; nor do we acknowledge any civil or political supremacy, or power over us in any foreign potentate or power, though that potentate might be the chief pastor of our church.[93]

Furthermore these men did not ignore, as is often assumed, the fact that the Pope ruled a temporal kingdom in Italy. While the theologians among them argued that this political dominion in no way derived from or affected the Holy See's spiritual authority, the entire hierarchy requested Orestes Brownson to drop from the cover of his Quarterly Review the letter of approbation it had signed earlier, partly because of an article Brownson wrote accepting the Pope's temporal power over his Italian Kingdom.[94] In this article Brownson had defended the most "ultra form of ultramontanism" (a term applied to a mid-nineteenth century movement that favored increasing the power of the Pope), against the advice of Bishop John Fitzpatrick, who had taught him that the Pope's authority was "purely spiritual."[95] "Most of the bishops" informed Brownson that his position was incorrect. Brownson recognized "after a while that they were right."[96] In making this decision the bishops were also motivated once again by their interest in securing effective religious liberty and continuing vigilance against those things that gave American Catholics a bad name. Brownson had also written an article on education and another on "Native Americanism." Some of the bishops viewed the article on education as an attack against the Catholic right to practice religious freedom by organizing and seeking funds for parochial schools.[97] Given American outcries against the immigrant character of the church, most of the bishops agreed with their colleague John Timon, who found the article on "Native Americanism" "especially objectionable."[98]

Leading the movement to rescind the letter of approbation was Bishop Michael O'Connor. He published, in the Pittsburgh diocesan paper, a brilliant critique of Brownson's assertions in the Spalding-England-Kenrick style. O'Connor was, according to Brownson, "more Republican" than Brownson. Convinced, however, that there was "no essential difference" between the bishop's "estimate of the common law" and his own, Brownson was gratified to find his views, which defended the theoretical compatibility of Catholicism and Republicanism, "so ably sustained" by O'Connor.[99] Thus did nineteenth century American bishops commit themselves to a theory of Papal power that the Church would not until the second half of the twentieth century officially acknowledge as any more than politically tolerable.

In the years following Vatican I (1869), Rome centralized its control over the entire Catholic communion by defining and propagating the doctrine of Papal infallibility. Pope Leo XIII, in speaking out against "irreligion" in Europe in his Syllabus of Errors and the Leonine Encyclicals, condemned separation of church and state as it existed there, where the extremes of violent separation or union of the two authorities were a historical reality. Leo's activities deeply affected American Catholicism. And Rome greatly strengthened its hold over the United States church by establishing the Apostolic Delegation in Washington, D.C. in 1893 and condemning "Americanism" in 1899.

Given this increasingly restrictive atmosphere, the American church tended to lose contact with the traditions established in its earlier and in many ways most innovative period. When these traditions came to life again in the 1950's, John Courtney Murray, although intent upon tracing their historical antecedents to the older European Catholic precepts, recognized and respected their place in the thinking of the bishops of the young American Republic.[100] These bishops would have felt at home in the Roman Catholic Church of the second half of the twentieth century; in their thinking and actions on the compatibility of republicanism and Catholicism they were men ahead of their times.

Notes

[1] For a discussion of a twentieth-century theologian's interpretation of these European events, see Thomas Love, John Courtney Murray: Contemporary Church-State Theory (New York, 1964). Taking form in the Leonine Corpus, the Church's official position regarding the relationship of the church to the state was not clearly defined during the period under consideration.

[2] John Tracy Ellis, Catholics in Colonial America (Baltimore, 1965), presents a factual account of the developments leading up to the national period in American Catholic history.

[3] Thomas Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal (2 vols.; London, 1917), I, 387.

[4] Peter Guilday, The Life and Times of John Carroll (2 vols.; New York, 1922), I, 151, 152, and chap. ix. See Appendix B for ecclesiastical definitions.

[5] Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus, I, 591, 592; Joseph Nuesse, The Social Thought of American Catholics, 1634-1829 (Washington, 1945), 100.

[6] Guilday, John Carroll, I, 208, 209.

[7] Annabelle Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore: Founder of the American Catholic Hierarchy (New York, 1955), chaps. i and ii. The American Catholic population increased from 35,000 (overwhelmingly Anglo-American) in 1790 to 195,000 in 1820. More than half (or 52 per cent) of this increase resulted from internal growth--natural, conversions, and the addition of Louisiana and the Floridas. The remainder (or 48 per cent) came from immigration.

[8] The Anglican Church in colonial America was nominally ruled by the Bishop of London. Attempts to create a colonial diocesan between 1638 and 1784, especially the efforts of the Reverend John Talbot, were unsuccessful. Bernard Bailyn, Ideological Origins of the American Revolution (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967), chap. vi, and William McLoughlin, "The Role of Religion in the Revolution: Liberty of Conscience and Cultural Cohesion

XUM

in the New Nation," 197-255 in S. Kurtz and J. Hutson, eds., Essays on the American Revolution (Chapel Hill, 1973), discuss this issue in the context of growing colonial opposition to British imperial control.

[9] Quoted in Guilday, John Carroll, I, 154, 155.

[10] Ibid.; Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus, I, 591, 592; Joseph Nuesse, Social Thought of American Catholics, 100.

[11] Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore, 35 and chap. v.

[12] Ibid. The members of the Select Body of the Clergy were all ex-Jesuits. They came from wealthy Anglo-American or English families. All had received an education second to none in Europe. Their very profession in the Society of Jesus was equivalent to high social and intellectual standing in centers such as Liège, Paris, London, and Rome. Guilday, John Carroll, I, 301-305, gives brief biographical portraits of the American Jesuits.

[13] John Carroll to Charles Plowden, April 10, 1784, Department of Archives and MSS, Catholic University of America (CUA), Washington, D.C.

[14] Guilday, John Carroll, I, 203.

[15] Carroll to Plowden, September 16, 1783, CUA.

[16] Leonard Neale to Carroll, January 11, 1785, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland.

[17] Carroll to Plowden, April 10, 1784, CUA.

[18] Actually, Benjamin Franklin and the Papal Nuncio in Paris entered into discussions in 1783 about providing a Catholic bishop for the United States. Franklin inquired of Congress, receiving in return the official statement that Congress had no competence in the matter. Unofficially, however, Franklin urged Rome to appoint John Carroll as bishop. Like-minded contemporaries supported Franklin's position, among them James Madison. See, Jules A. Baisnée, France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy: The Myth of French Interference, 1783-1784 (Baltimore, 1934); Donald O. Dewey, "James Madison's 'Public' as Interpreter of the

Constitution" (paper presented at the Pacific Coast Branch, American Historical Association meeting, August, 1974).

[19] Philadelphia Columbian Magazine, December, 1787; New York United States Gazette, May 9, 1789.

[20] Elihu S. Riley, Correspondence of "First Citizen," Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and "Antillon," Daniel Dulany, Jr., 1773 (Baltimore, 1902). Although the main point at issue in these debates was the patriot cause, both men managed to sneak in personal innuendos. Dulany taunted Carroll for his Catholicism, and Carroll sneered at Dulany for having been an indentured servant. Joseph Greene, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832 (New York, 1932).

[21] Philadelphia American Museum, June 10, 1789.

[22] Mary Virginia Gieger, Daniel Carroll, A Framer Of The Constitution (Washington, 1943), 163, 164.

[23] Simon Bruté to Charles Wharton, March 30, 1816 and Wharton to Bruté, April 20, 1816, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky; Thomas Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus, I, 722.

[24] Carroll to Plowden, September 26, 1783, CUA.

[25] Charles Wharton, A Concise View of the Principal Points of Controversy Between the Protestant and Roman Churches (New York, 1817). This volume contains Wharton's Letter, Carroll's Address, and Wharton's reply to the Address. Wharton became an Episcopalian minister. In 1785 he was made rector of the Episcopal church at New Castle, Delaware.

[26] Ibid.; Guilday, John Carroll, I, 119; Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus, I, 631.

[27] Quoted in Guilday, John Carroll, I, 132.

[28] Robert Bellarmine, De Laicis, or the Treatise on Civil Government, tr. Kathleen E. Murphy (New York, 1928), 27.

[29] John Courtney Murray, "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power," *Theological Studies*, IX (December, 1948), 491-535; Murray, "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State in the Light of History," ibid., X (June, 1949), 177-234.

[30] Carroll to Joseph Berington, 1787, and Carroll's Pastoral Letter, February 22, 1797, BCA; Carroll's *Address* in Wharton, *A Concise View*; New York *United States Gazette*, June 10, 1789.

[31] Ibid.

[32] Murray, "Separation of Church and State," *America*, LXXVI (December 7, 1946), 263.

[33] Carroll's Pastoral Letter, February 22, 1797, BCA.

[34] Quoted in Guilday, *John Carroll*, I, 132.

[35] Carroll to Cardinal Antonelli, July 23, 1785, BCA.

[36] Evidently concerned that in America the forms of worship might become alienated from personal religiosity, Carroll wrote Berington to discuss the "use of the Latin tongue in the public liturgy of the Church." Before Michael Egan became a bishop, he asked Carroll's permission to chant vespers at St. Mary's Church in Philadelphia in English, saying: "I understand from the Rev. Mr. Rossiter, who on a former occasion consulted your Lordship on that subject, that you are not adverse to the principle. One good effect it is hoped will result from this mode, it will be an incitement to the congregation to be more punctual at evening vespers . . . as they may all then join in singing evening praise to God in a language they understand." In a letter to Antonelli, Carroll opposed sending Americans to study at the Urban College, Rome, because they had to take a mission oath, binding them to that institution--a requirement Rome eventually withdrew. Carroll to Berington, 1787, BCA; Egan to Carroll, January 21, 1805, ibid.; Carroll to Antonelli, July 23, 1785, ibid.

[37] Carroll to Plowden, October, 1791, CUA.

[38] Thomas Hanley, "Archbishop Carroll and the French Revolution," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXXI (September-December 1960), 67-72.

XUM

[39] Carroll to Plowden, September 24, 1796, CUA; Carroll, *Eulogy on George Washington* (New York, 1931).

[40] Ibid.; "The Address of the Roman Catholics" to the President in John Carroll Brent, *Biographical Sketch of the Most Reverend John Carroll* (Baltimore, 1843), 144-147.

[41] Ibid., 144, 145.

[42] John Cheverus to _____, December 1, 1820, Library of the American Unitarian Association, Boston, Massachusetts. The article was written by Samuel L. Knapp, a friend and defender of Cheverus, and was published in the *Palladium*, February 18, 22, 1820.

[43] Annabelle Melville, *Jean Lefebvre de Cheverus, 1768-1836* (Milwaukee, 1958), chap. ii. In 1823 Rome ordered Cheverus to accept translation to the French See of Montauban. In a letter to his friend Bruté, September 24, 1823, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN, Cheverus opposed this action. But he eventually submitted.

[44] Vincent P. Lannie, *Public Money and Parochial Education: Bishop Hughes, Governor Seward and the New York School Controversy* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1968), 245-258; Benedict Flaget to Anthony Blanc, October 21, 1842, New Orleans Collection, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana. Francis Kenrick wrote Paul Cullen, March 28, 1843, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid., that Hughes had been "fairly worsted" in the education dispute. Cullen was rector of the Irish College in Rome and Roman agent to some of the members of the American hierarchy.

[45] *National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919*, ed. Peter Guilday (Washington, 1923), 190.

[46] John Hughes, "Speech in St. Patrick's School-Room," July 20, 1840, "Speech in the Basement of St. Jame's Church," July 27, October 5, 19, 1840, and "Address of the Catholics to their Fellow-Citizens of the City and State of New York" in *The Complete Works of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D.*, ed. Lawrence Kehoe (2 vols.; New York, 1865), I, 41-66, 107-125.

XUM

[47] Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884* (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 81-154; Hughes to Purcell, September 1831, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN, and chap. vii for a discussion of the bishops' church building; Flaget to Badin, September 29, 1826 and Flaget's Journal, September 1827, NDA; F. Kenrick to Propaganda, December 11, 1823, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid. and Flaget to Blanc, January 11, 1820, New Orleans Collection, ibid.; David to Bruté, November 15, 1826, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN, in which David was pleased to say that the jubilee was "spreading all over the place."

[48] *National Pastorals*, 87.

[49] F. Kenrick to Tobias Kirby, August 21, 1845, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[50] See chap. iv for a complete discussion of this issue.

[51] Sidney E. Mead, *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America* (New York, 1963), chaps. vi and vii.

[52] Paul Leo Gregoire, "The Relations Between Félicité de Lamennais and Simon de Bruté" (M.A. thesis, University of Notre Dame, 1961).

[53] David to Bruté, February 28, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[54] *Oeuvres Completes*, eds. Paul Daubree et Cailleux (12 vols.; Paris, 1836, 1837); *De la religion considéreé dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil* (Paris, 1826).

[55] Flaget to Bruté, May 1, 1830 and David to Bruté, February 28, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[56] David to Bruté, December 23, 1825, ibid. According to Harold J. Laski, *Authority in the Modern State* (New Haven, 1927), 213, Lamennais's *sensus communis* theory "left open the road to liberalism, because Lamennais . . . had only to convince himself that the majority of men disbelieved in ecclesiastical conservatism to be able to urge its untruth."

XUM

[57] David to Bruté, February 28, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[58] The Jacobins used the term laicization, meaning dechristianization. John Courtney Murray, "Leo XIII On Church and State: The General Structure of the Controversy," *Theological Studies*, XIV (March, 1953), 530, points out that "the people" meant the sect of Jacobins, the political heirs of the philosophs. The French Revolution was, in effect, "Jacobin Sectarianism, as a set of ideas and as a sociological force." Christopher Dawson, *Beyond Politics* (New York, 1939), 71, observes that "the new [French] Republic as conceived by Robespierre and St. Just and by their master Rousseau before them was a spiritual community, based on definite moral doctrines and finding direct religious expression in an official civic cult. . . . Thus, the democratic community became a counter-church of which Robespierre was at once the high priest and the Grand Inquisitor, while Catholicism and atheism alike were ruthlessly proscribed." This laic state, which Murray referred to as "totalitarian democracy," destroyed the dyarchy of the individual and thus his freedom.

[59] *Des Progrés de La Revolution et de La Guerre contre L'Eglise* (Paris, 1829), 87.

[60] Bruté to William Gaston, September 29, 1830, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA.

[61] Bruté to Gaston, October 1, 1830, ibid.

[62] Bruté to Gaston, September 29, 1830, ibid.

[63] Bruté to Gaston, August 28, 1828, ibid.

[64] Bruté to Gaston, February 29, 1831, ibid.

[65] England to Cullen, December 15, 1833, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[66] England to Bruté, October 31, 1831, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[67] Bruté to Gaston, October 1, 1830, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA.

[68] Flaget to Bruté, November 12, 1825, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[69] Columba Fox, The Life of the Right Reverend John Baptist Mary David, 1761-1841: Bishop of Bardstown and Founder of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth (New York, 1925), 109, 110, 174, 175, for a list of David's tracts; Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown (Bardstown, Kentucky, 1825), was printed by the authority of Flaget. David to Edward Fenwick, November 19, 1825, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; In a letter to Bruté, August 27, 1823, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN, David said that England and Maréchal both suggested he "retire to a convent of the sisters where he could write."

[70] David to Bruté, May 11, 1834, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[71] Peter Loras to Blanc, December 27, 1838, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[72] _____ (Etienne, France) to Blanc, August 14, 1849 and Michael Portier to Blanc, 1848, ibid.

[73] John Chanche to Blanc, April 15, 1848, ibid.

[74] Purcell to England, October 9, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[75] Michael O'Connor to Purcell, April 22, 1846, Cincinnati Collection, and F. Kenrick to Cullen, February 18, June 23, 1840, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[76] Richard Martial, in a letter to Propaganda, reported that Flaget suffered a great loss when Kenrick was made Coadjutor Bishop of Philadelphia--"Kenrick has made a great reputation for himself." Kenrick had been Flaget's theologian at the First Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829, and Flaget wanted Kenrick as his successor to the See of Bardstown. Martial to Propaganda, June 6, 1830, 509r to 510r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[77] Fox, David, 123, 124; Guy Chabrat, Ignatius Reynolds, and John McGill were among those members of the hierarchy who attended Bardstown Seminary. Spalding, who succeeded his teacher Kenrick as Archbishop of Baltimore, was probably the most distinguished Bardstown alumnus. As a student, he was so outstanding that his teachers sent him to the Urban College of the Propaganda in Rome for further theological training. In Flaget's

letter to Propaganda, he told the Congregation that Spalding had "acute intelligence" and was "able to learn all things." Upon returning from Rome, Spalding joined his former mentors on the Bardstown faculty, started the Catholic Advocate (a literary review), and gave numerous lectures to Catholic religious (priests, nuns, bishops) and lay and non-Catholic audiences. Bishop Celestine de la Hailandiere told Bishop Peter Lefevere that he had asked Rome to make Spalding coadjutor of his diocese, and Flaget responded by complaining to Rome about the possibility of losing Spalding to Hailandiere. Spalding finally became Coadjutor and then Bishop of Bardstown. Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA; Spalding, "Dates Of My Life," "Certificate of Holy Orders," and "Appointment to St. Joseph's Parish At Bardstown, Kentucky," January 12, 1835, Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, ibid.; Hailandiere to Lefevere, August 9, 1844, Detroit Collection, ibid.; Flaget to Propaganda, July 12, 1844, 1157v to 1158v, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[78] See in NDA: England to Purcell, October 9, 1834; F. Kenrick to Cullen, February 18, June 23, 1840, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69; O'Connor to Purcell, April 22, 1846, Cincinnati Collection; and _____ to Propaganda, June 6, 1830, 509r to 510r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale.

[79] Martin Spalding, "Influence of the Papacy on Civil Liberty, 1838-1858," Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, ibid.

[80] England was constantly annoyed at suggestions that he was about to be translated to Ireland. He first expressed this concern in a letter to Bruté. In 1834 the Western bishops wrote to Rome expressing their concern. They said: "having heard from Bishop England that he is to be removed from Charleston, the bishops gathered for consecration of the St. Louis Cathedral and the consecration of Bp. Bruté of Vincennes humbly ask the Cardinal Prefect that the Bishop [England] not be lost either to Charleston or to the United States." Initiated by the group of bishops, the letter was sent by Purcell to Propaganda. And Flaget, in a letter to Propaganda, praised England, suggesting the Propaganda make him a traveling bishop. Flaget said: "Oh! Would that such a gospel orator conspicuous for such great

XUM

learning and piety might not have his own diocese, with this in view that, all the bishops of the province consenting, he [England] could visit every diocese, and there be preaching and discoursing concerning the principles of the Catholic religion, stay there one or two months" and move on to another diocese and repeat his performance. England to Bruté, May 20, 1829, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; Purcell to Propaganda, October 31, 1834, and Flaget to Same, April, n.d., 445r to 447r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[81] England, "The Republic in Danger," September 19, 1831, in The Works of the Rt. Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston, ed. Sebastian Messmer (7 vols.; Cleveland, 1908), IV, 495. Messmer was a bishop in the second half of the nineteenth century and has been considered a conservative on the issue of church and state.

[82] England to Gaston, June 29, 1838, American Catholic Historical Society Archives (ACHS), St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

[83] "Some Letters of John England," n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[84] England, "The Calumnies of J. Blanco White," January 1, 1827, Works, II, 351.

[85] "Some Letters of John England," n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[86] England, "Catholic Doctrine Misrepresented," Works, III, 152.

[87] England, "The Calumnies," 328.

[88] England to Gaston, June 29, 1838, ACHS.

[89] England, "Catholic Doctrine," 152.

[90] Hughes, "Sermon on Catholic Emancipation," May 31, 1828, Kehoe, Complete Works, I, 35, 36.

[91] Spalding, "Civil and Religious Liberty, 1838-1859," Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, NDA.

[92] Spalding, "Influence of Catholicity on Civil Liberty," n.d., ibid.

[93] National Pastorals, 91.

[94] Orestes A. Brownson to _____, 1866, Orestes A. Brownson Papers, NDA.

[95] Brownson had originally written his article in accord with Fitzpatrick's perspective, reworking it to include acceptance of the Pope's temporal power in his Italian Kingdom on the advice of theologian Father Jeremiah W. Cummings. After a while, Brownson returned to his original position, which was in harmony with Fitzpatrick's. In a letter to Isaac Hecker, Brownson said that Fitzpatrick was a "man of powerful intellect, and devoted to his office," September 24, 1844, Orestes A. Brownson Papers, NDA.

[96] Spalding to Purcell, July 12, 1854, October 9, 1855, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; Brownson to O'Connor, June 28, 1854, September 1855 and O'Connor to Brownson, September 4, 1855, December 7, 1857, Orestes A. Brownson Papers, ibid.

[97] Spalding to Purcell, July 12, October 9, 1855 and Timon to Purcell, August 3, 1845, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; Brownson to Hughes, July 3, 1854, Orestes A. Brownson Papers, ibid.

[98] Timon to Purcell, August 3, 1854, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[99] Brownson to O'Connor, April 5, 1852 and O'Connor to Brownson, September 5, 1855, Orestes A. Brownson Papers, ibid.

[100] John Courtney Murray, "Separation of Church and State; True and False Concepts," America, LXXVI (October-March 1946-47), 541-545; Murray, "Pluralism in America," Thought, 291 (Spring-Winter 1954-55), 165-208; Murray, "The Church and the Council: The Drama and the Issues Behind the Speeches 'on the Nature of the Church,'" America, CIX (July-December 1963), 451-455.

IV. EPISCOPACY AND PAPACY

In defining their relationship to Rome, the bishops were once again influenced by a combination of conditions, not least of which was America's geographical distance from the center of Church authority and the Vatican's preoccupation with other challenges. While the American hierarchy was organizing its church, the Roman Curia immersed itself in the problems of the Napoleonic Era in Europe, taking at best a secondary interest in the new Republic's Catholics.[1] Responding to the social and political climate of the United States as well as the turbulent condition of American Catholicism, the bishops took advantage of Rome's relative unconcern to develop both a distinctive theology and set of procedures to order the relationship of episcopacy to Papacy.

Collectively the prelates of the early national period were unswerving in their devotion and loyalty to Rome, but their fidelity displayed a distinctively American twist. They maintained that their allegiance belonged exclusively to the Pope, but (as previously discussed) that in both belief and practice such fidelity was properly confined to spiritual matters and excluded politics. As late as 1853 the bishops boldly demonstrated their continuing opposition to any foreign interference that appeared to be mixed with political considerations when they opposed the semi-official visit to the United States of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini. Sent by Rome, Bedini was supposed to examine American Catholic affairs and the possibility of establishing a Papal diplomatic envoy (in Catholic terminology, an apostolic nuncio) in the United States. Bedini made his visit despite the hue and cry. It ended in fiasco.[2]

More or less agreeing on the nature of Papal power, America's prelates meanwhile examined the extent to which the Pope or "chief bishop," as they often called him, should share his spiritual power with the other bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. Here also Carroll led the way, articulating and defending as the "constant belief of all Catholics" what in ecclesiastical terminology is called episcopal collegiality. This theory, which is based on the assumption that Christ, not Peter, is the center of Catholic unity, places the locus of Church authority in the united action of Pope and bishops, whether dispersed in their individual sees or meeting in a general council. Perhaps Carroll's clearest statement on episcopal collegiality occurred in his lengthy and highly publicized debate, examined earlier, with the apostasized

American priest, Charles Wharton. "I will venture to assert," Carroll said,

> that Wharton cannot cite one Catholic divine, who denies infallibility to reside in the body of the bishops, united and agreeing with their head, the bishop of Rome. So that when the Chaplain [Wharton] says, *that schoolmen have taught infallibility of the Pope--some place it in a general council; and others in the Pope and council, received by the whole church*, . . . he is under a great mistake for the last is not a mere opinion of schoolmen, but the constant belief of all Catholics; a belief, in which there is no variation.[3]

Later American bishop-theologians wrote and lectured extensively in support of the collegiality theory. Martin Spalding denied that Catholics had ever believed that "any man or particular body of men *of themselves* via nature are infallible." Infallibility resided in the bishops, "that august body of teachers, whether dispersed or in Council," that Christ had promised to secure from error.[4] Drawing an analogy between the governments of the Church and of the United States, Spalding compared the college of bishops to the American Congress and the Pope's prerogatives to those of the President.[5] John England declared that "the Bishops who succeed to the Apostolic Commission, together with the Bishop of Rome [whether] in Council assembled, or teaching in their Sees," form the tribunal of the infallible Church. Of course, England limited the authority of this tribunal, as he had that of the Pope, to spiritual matters; it did not reach to "mere concerns of this world."[6] Bishop Francis Kenrick's treatise defending in similar fashion the collegiality concept bore the approval and profited from the advice of a number of his fellow-bishops. At a meeting in Rome concerning the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, Kenrick, supported by Michael O'Connor, objected to the misuse of evidence from Scripture, the Fathers, and conciliar tradition. An amended document was drafted, and O'Connor requested it be made clear that the correction appeared "with the consent of the bishops."[7]

Some American prelates did argue for the contrary doctrine of Papal infallibility, of course, professing to see in their colleagues' "liberal" theories on the relationship of the Catholic Church to the American state and of episcopacy to Papacy an inclination toward Gallicanism.[8] Their arguments anticipated Rome's later confusion of religious developments in Europe with those in America.[9] Carroll and like-minded colleagues were in fact passionately committed to Roman spiritual unity; they denounced Gallicanism and believed such an arrangement could never be effected in America, for it was antithetical to the religious liberty that the Republic's principles of separation of church and state affirmed.[10]

But they could not persuade Bishops like Benedict Fenwick and Simon Bruté, who tended to accept French theologian Joseph de Maistre's argument, developed in his Du Pape, that episcopal collegiality and Gallicanism were synonymous.[11] Bishop John David suggested also a practical reason for accepting Papal infallibility. If all the bishops of the Church had to decide upon important spiritual matters, it could take years to reach any judgments. "If news must be obtained from all parts of the world," he asked, "how long must one wait before decisions affecting the entire Catholic communion are known?" On theoretical issues, however, David had one foot in each camp. He found Du Pape to be "one of the best books" he had ever read.[12] On the other hand, he applauded Lamennais's liberal position on the relationship between church and state, finding that theologian's enthusiasm for liberty "scarcely proper" for France but "fitted for the United States."[13] Furthermore, David avoided the entire subject of Papal infallibility in the catechism he wrote for use in the Diocese of Bardstown.[14]

Despite individual disagreements, the bishops collectively supported episcopal collegiality. For lay instruction they used the Bardstown Catechism and another catechism that answered the question "must not Catholics believe the Pope himself to be infallible?" as follows:

"This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige under pain of heresy unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body, that is, by the bishops of the church."[15] Episcopal collegiality was the correct doctrine, the bishops said in a joint Pastoral Letter, because "Christ gave to the Apostles [directly and not through Peter], as a Ministerial Body which was to have perpetual existence by the perpetual succession of its members," the powers He had received from His Father.[16] Finally, the bishops summed up in their Pastoral Letter of 1852 the theoretical relationship with Rome that they had spent a half-century defining. Affirming their attachment to the Holy See as the "centre of Catholic [spiritual] unity," they declared that

> Bishops, . . . who are the successors of the Apostles, and whom the Holy Spirit has placed to rule the Church of God, which He acquired with His own blood, agreeing and judging together with its head on earth, the Roman Pontiff, whether they are gathered in general councils, or dispersed throughout the world, are inspired from on high with the gift of inerrancy, so that their body or college can never fail in faith nor define anything against any doctrine revealed by God.[17]

The bishops were not by such statements preoccupied with creating an academic theology. Nor were they religious democrats. Such conclusions concerning their relationship to Rome reflected their search for means of establishing an ordered, stable, and unified American church. They had found this means to be the centralization, rationalization, and nationalization of the decision-making power. Whatever the differences between them, the American bishops responded with amazing unanimity to the real and suspected consequences of Roman interference with their efforts to order the church in the United States.

Rome had had difficulty deciding how to organize American Catholics, being used to dealing with civil governments in the administration of its national communions. In 1789 the Holy See, as previously described, created an American hierarchy, with bishops enjoying lifetime tenure, rather than appointing a Papal administrator or vicar-apostolic, whose service would be at the pleasure of the Curia. This decision stemmed in part from the unique political and social situation in the United States. Simultaneously, the Pope decided to conduct official business with the American church through the Curia agency known as the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith. The American prelates distrusted the Italian dominated Congregation, considering it a potential obstacle to both their individual authority and their efforts at episcopal unity, as well as a negative influence upon the public image of the church. They thought Propaganda misunderstood, as one put it, the "American mind," and was "woefully ignorant of . . . the geography, manners, temper of the people--and ignorant of the state of religion here."[18]

The hierarchy's most important confrontation with Propaganda revolved about American ecclesiastical expansion and selection of bishops for the United States. Before 1789, the American clergy fought for and won the privilege of choosing the city for their first see and nominating Carroll their first bishop. In 1795 Carroll picked Leonard Neale as Coadjutor Bishop of Baltimore with the right of succession. He also sent out feelers to the clergy respecting the advisability of dividing the diocese.[19] Encouraged by their response, Carroll petitioned Rome to elevate Baltimore to an archbishopric (also referred to as a metropolitan or province) and to make Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and Bardstown the seat of bishops who would be "suffragan" or subordinate to Baltimore. He nominated foreign-born priests who were seasoned American missionaries for Boston, Bardstown, and Philadelphia, but suggested that New York, for want of a suitable candidate, be temporarily placed under the jurisdiction of Boston.[20] With the advice of Propaganda, Pope Pius VII in 1808 granted Carroll's petition and ratified his nominations.

In succeeding years, however, the pendulum of power swung toward Rome and nominations by Propaganda came into style. Rome's new initiative was for the most part a sincere attempt to respond to the demands of Irish lay trustees and their clerical supporters for the appointment of bishops who would understand them--for, in short, compatriots. Thus Propaganda chose Irish-born Luke Concanen, a Roman resident, for the Diocese of New York. Consecrated in Rome, Concanen died while awaiting passage from Naples to the United States.[21] New York remaining vacant, the American bishops seized the initiative. Acting in concert at their meeting in 1810, they bypassed Propaganda and appealed directly to the Pope for the privilege of nominating their own colleagues. They asked "the Supreme Pastor of the Church to allow the nomination of the vacant Diocese [of New York] to proceed solely from the Archbishop and Bishops" of the Province of Baltimore.[22] Four years later, the rumor, later confirmed, reached the United States that Propaganda had elevated Irishman John Connolly to New York, thus ignoring the prelates' plea.[23] This was followed in 1819 by Propaganda's appointment of another Irishman, Henry Conwell, to fill the Philadelphia vacancy left by the death in 1812 of Bishop Michael Egan.[24] The next year the Roman Congregation elevated the Irish priest

John England to be Bishop of the new Diocese of Charleston, South Carolina, and created the See of Richmond, Virginia, selecting Irish-born Patrick Kelly, a former student of John Connolly, to be bishop there.[25]

The American prelates opposed these appointments. Contrary to generally accepted modern opinion, their opposition resulted more from the desire to control the selection of their membership than from ethno-cultural animosities. True enough, several of the French- and American-born prelates did express a concern over the social immorality of numbers of Irish-born laymen and pastors, and complained of the lack of qualifications of many of the priests. These suspicions were confirmed by a European cleric who wrote that clergymen there wished all "malefactors" within the priesthood "would go to America [so] at least Europe would be delivered."[26] Writing to Propaganda, a French-born American bishop asserted that he and his colleagues "esteem and even venerate priests who are commendable for piety, zeal, and learning, whatever their nationality; but they are and always will be opposed to those who are addicted to drink, gaming, or other vices. . . . "[27] Even the Irish-born bishops in America voiced disapproval of immoral, unruly, and poorly educated Irish clerics. John England was initially enamored with some of the allegedly refractory Irish priests, aiding them in their causes and appointing some of them to congregations in the Charleston Diocese. He had even introduced a plan to recruit trained Irish clerics, which his colleagues, however, unanimously defeated.[28] As time went on, however, England became disenchanted and wrote French-born Ambrose Maréchal, third Archbishop of Baltimore, to send him "three or four good priests," since he had been "dreadfully disappointed" in some of the Irishmen.[29] Michael O'Connor observed that one of his Irish clerics "could not appreciate the peculiar character of the country he was living in, and was unwilling to renounce or change anything which he had seen done by what he called good priests in Ireland."[30] Of course, the bishops had to accept and appoint Irish pastors to American congregations, partly because so few American-born Catholic males chose religious vocations. But they refused actively to recruit them, preferring instead to mold their own national clergy. Some bishops advocated building and supporting one national seminary, arguing that an American-trained priesthood would assure succession to the hierarchy of properly qualified and highly disciplined men.[31]

Clearly, in exercising their wish to control the selection of their own colleagues the bishops preferred

XUM

those who had been born and trained or, at the very least, experienced in the American mission, as clearly reflected in the group's collective biographical portrait presented in Chapter II. And they often said as much. French-born Bishop John Dubourg wrote to American-born Bishop Edward Fenwick, that he knew England had proposed Irishman John Power for the projected See of Florida. Dubourg had "no objections to Power's personal qualities." Actually, he thought Power to be "an Irish Clergyman of excellent reputation." For Florida, however, he would "prefer a native of America, even with . . . qualifications . . . inferior" to Power's. With this in mind, Dubourg also opposed candidates born and educated in France for that see.[32] England, who had indeed proposed Power, agreed with Dubourg. In a letter to Marechal, England said he would "unhesitatingly recommend an American in preference to any other" to be Bishop of Florida, and specifically approved Bishop Fenwick's brother--also Dubourg's choice--for the post.[33]

Thus the bishops determined to do what was necessary to convince the Pope that Propaganda was under "a great misapprehension" as to the true "State of Religion in the United States."[34] Most of them were sure, and correctly so, that Propaganda had been frightened into nominating foreign priests to American sees.

As Archbishop Maréchal expressed it, Propaganda had responded to the "chimera" of an independent and schismatic American church that "malcontents" in Charleston, Norfolk, Philadelphia, and New York had raised.[35] From the prelates' perspective, Propaganda had patronized Irish-Catholic laymen and their clerical compatriots in New York and Philadelphia by appointing Bishops Concanen, Connolly, and Conwell.

Certainly this is what happened in Norfolk and Charleston. Irish-Catholic laymen and priests in those cities had chafed under Archbishop Carroll's restraining hand. They broke into open rebellion under Archbishop Neale, and refused to recognize Archbishop Maréchal's authority over them.[36] This clique, with Bishop Connolly's support, initially asked Propaganda to create a new southeastern diocese consisting of all the Archdiocese of Baltimore south of Maryland, and to appoint Irish-born Father Thomas Carbry as its bishop.[37] Against this scheme, a priest stationed at Norfolk informed Maréchal that the laymen there said a "thousand ridiculous things, display 5 or 6 more letters in Latin which they say are from Rome: that there is a Bishop . . . coming here; . . . that the Bishop of Baltimore has nothing to do with the church of Virginia; etc."[38] Ignoring Connolly's warning that "if Carbry considered himself authorized by the Pope to exercise pastoral duties in Norfolk then it will be no easy matter to induce him to desist from them," Marêchal threatened Carbry with excommunication if he administered to either group of laymen. And he publicly accused the Irish of using American liberties to create an Irish National Church in the United States.[39]

Rome's plan for settling this volatile situation was unacceptable to the American bishops. At a meeting in 1819 Propaganda approved the hierarchy's recommendation for the creation of the Diocese of Charleston, but rejected their nominee--American-born and -trained Benedict Fenwick--in favor of an Irish priest who had never been to the United States, John England. Heeding the requests of lay Catholics and those "private priests" who "tripped backwards and forwards to Rome . . . complaining against their ecclesiastical heads," Propaganda also created the Diocese of Richmond and selected Patrick Kelly as its bishop.[40]

As archbishop, Marêchal directed the American protest. In letters to Propaganda and to his Roman agent, the Reverend William Gradwell, he strenuously objected to the creation of the Richmond diocese and to the appointment of a foreign priest there. He also criticized the repeated concessions to schismatic laymen and their allegedly recalcitrant clerical supporters, whose challenge to ecclesiastical authority was a general one, and protested Rome's continued meddling in the selection of American prelates.[41]

Moving from complaint to action, Maréchal then defied Propaganda's mandate and refused to recognize the authority of Patrick Kelly. In this he was following the example of his predecessor Leonard Neale, who in 1817 had rejected a ruling of Propaganda directing him to reinstate two Charleston priests whom he had suspended for involvement in lay schisms, for "excess in drink," and for other shortcomings.[42] This was not the spontaneous or irrational act of an angered man. Maréchal sent along with the notice of this action a theological brief. After learning of the Richmond appointment, he had sought the advice of a canonist at Georgetown College who counseled him to refuse to install Kelly, assuring him that it was uncanonical for Propaganda to dismember the Archdiocese of Baltimore without the archbishop's consent. The "Holy Father would never proceed in such an illegal and injurious manner," the canonist advised; and Maréchal's objection would demonstrate to "propaganda that they cannot do all what pleases them. . . ."[43] Assured of the support of all the bishops except Connolly and England, Maréchal

XUM

finally went to Rome to argue his case before Propaganda and ultimately the Pope. He persuaded the members of the Roman Congregation that their appointments of foreigners to the hierarchy in the United States would not result in a stable and unified American church, despite vociferous Irish lay and clerical claims to the contrary. Acknowledging the success of his appeal, Rome tacitly consented to allow American bishops the privilege of nominating their colleagues-to-be. Propaganda also recalled Kelly and deferred the appointment of a bishop to Richmond until such time as the American hierarchy was ready to suggest one.[44] In a humorous note on Propaganda's reversal, Benedict Fenwick marveled that "wonders will never cease in this world. . . . Nothing but doing and undoing."[45]

Thereafter the bishops further consolidated their hold upon decision-making by presenting a united front to Rome; by 1829 experience had taught them that the key to autonomy lay in united action. In that year they revived the practice, dormant since the session of 1810, of holding frequent meetings or councils. At these sessions the bishops not only discussed mutual problems but passed legislation on matters of discipline and faith (discussed more fully in Chapter VI) that would be binding on all American Catholics. Even before the establishment of the Diocese of Baltimore in 1789, the Select Body of the Clergy had governed American Catholics in three General Chapters held at Whitemarsh, Maryland, between 1783 and 1789 and in separate district meetings. After Carroll was elected bishop, he called a Diocesan Synod in Baltimore in 1791, and again in 1810. At the 1810 meeting provisions were made to hold another joint session in 1812, which--for various reasons--was postponed until the First Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829.[46] In the following decades the bishops met more regularly and legislated more widely than any other national hierarchy in the Western Church, conducting a total of seven Provincial Councils, followed by the First Plenary Council in 1852.[47] By choosing to rule through a so-called conciliar system, these men were actually implementing the concept of episcopal collegiality already described.

How did Rome react to this revival of American conciliar government? For more than a decade Propaganda quietly approved the Act et Decreta of the councils, with the exception of toning down the strident measure against the lay-trusteeism the bishops passed at their 1829 meeting.[48] Not unduly upset by Rome's amendment, the bishops were, however, chagrined when Propaganda simultaneously and peremptorily ordered Bishop Henry

Conwell of Philadelphia to surrender all administration and jurisdiction of his diocese to the coadjutor of that see. Conwell, who had been one of Rome's appointees, sanctioned the desires of one faction of lay trustees to appoint and dismiss priests against the wishes of other lay and clerical factions. Father Michael Egan, who had been sent to Rome by the American bishops to keep an eye on Propaganda, wrote to Simon Bruté, telling him that Propaganda was determined to remove Conwell. It had been intimidated, as usual, by schismatic priests and "unruly" elements in the American church.[49] Since the members of Propaganda had tried to "keep their determinations a secret," Egan said he had heard about the Roman decision in private conversations. Adding that he, of course, agreed with the American bishops in condemning Conwell's activities, he wanted Bruté to inform those bishops that Rome's contemplated solution to the problem was a "step which will go to undermine episcopal authority in the U.S." Certain that Conwell would "cry aloud against this decision," Egan predicted further aggravation of an already delicate situation.[50]

A few years later Propaganda again attempted to discipline an American bishop. This time the Congregation ordered John Dubois of New York to resign. Propaganda thought it was acting in accord with the

American bishops' wishes. Most of them had denounced Dubois's surrender to a group of New York lay trustees as detrimental to the consolidation of the hierarchy's authority. Senior spokesman Benedict Flaget succinctly expressed his American colleagues' sentiments when he announced that Propaganda's action left him "thunderstruck."[51] It was not what was done; it was how it was done. Throughout the prolonged and highly publicized New York trouble, Flaget had written his fellow bishops and Rome, supporting the transfer of effective diocesan control from Dubois to the New York Coadjutor.[52] He was, however, astounded at the "mode in which Propaganda had done this" to Dubois, and seriously considered writing to Rome, "begging that if I ever fall into a state incompatible with the government of my diocese, I might be advised [rather than ordered] to resign."[53] If only the American bishops could quietly and discreetly deal with both the Dubois and still unsettled Conwell matters. They did.

America's prelates successfully convinced Rome that it was in the best interests of everyone for them to discipline their own people. To ask either Dubois or Conwell to resign would be disastrous. Meddlesome laymen and priests certainly would interpret such a move as a victory for presbyterianism over episcopacy, to say

XUM

nothing of the unsavory publicity sure to follow. Both bishops therefore were allowed to retain their official status. Effective power, however, was transferred to the coadjutors of New York and Philadelphia.

Indeed, Rome had relented again. This was, of course, partly because the Curia was still preoccupied with more important European challenges. But Propaganda had a habit of waffling on American questions. The Roman Congregation was clearly, as the bishops frequently asserted, ignorant of conditions in the United States. It always had difficulty deciding whether dissatisfied laymen and priests or their undaunted bishops were the most reliable source of information on American developments. Apparently, however, Maréchal's personal appearance in Rome, reinforced by his colleagues' incessant campaign--carried on through visits to Rome and lobbyists stationed there--had swung the pendulum of influence in the prelates' favor.[54] And the hierarchy had success on its side. After all, the bishops could prove to Rome that under their tutelage Catholicism was demonstrably on its way to becoming the most populous and highly organized religious denomination in the United States.[55] Actually, by 1852 Catholics were the largest single denomination in the country. Table 17 indicates that there was indeed an important gain in the

TABLE 17. American Catholics and their Proportion of the White Population of the United States in Selected Census Years

	N	%
1790	35,000	1.1
1820	195,000	2.5
1830	318,000	3.0
1840	663,000	4.7
1850	1,605,900	8.2
1860	3,102,900	11.5

Source: Calculated from Shaughnessy, Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?, 73, 117, 125, 134, 145.

XUM

Catholic percentage of the total population, and, as Table 18 shows, in the thirty-year period before the Civil War Catholics made up around 40 per cent of all immigration into the United States.

Fourteen years after the meeting of 1829, however, the question of Propaganda's interference rose again, this time keyed to Western rather than Eastern ecclesiastical expansion and to French-Canadian rather than Irish antagonists. Seasoned governors by then, the bishops readily acted together. At the Fifth Provincial Council, held in 1843, they responded to the premature organization by the United States government of Oregon Territory by successfully requesting Rome to appoint a temporary Papal deputy or vicar-apostolic for Oregon. Rome named Francis Norbert Blanchet, a French-Canadian, to that position.[56] In a private session at the next Provincial Council, held three years later, the prelates considered elevating the Diocese of St. Louis to an archbishopric.[57] Since the western boundary of that see included portions of the Pacific coastal areas being claimed by both the United States and Great Britain, they decided the scheme was momentarily inexpediant. In a longer perspective, ecclesiastical stratification into more than one archdiocese, or province, involved the risk of minimizing concerted hierarchical action. It would certainly

TABLE 18. Catholic Immigrants to the United States and their Proportion of Total Immigrants, 1831-1860

	N	%
1831-1840	240,220	40.1
1841-1850	700,777	40.9
1851-1860	985,157	37.9

Source: Calculated from Shaughnessy, Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?, 123, 131, 140.

create pressures that could disengage the gears of a system the hierarchy had engineered on the principle of compactness. Conceivably, the result could be a plurality of "catholic" churches in the United States.

While the prelates deliberated, Propaganda acted. With the advice of Oregon Vicar-Apostolic Blanchet and his French-Canadian supporters, Rome created on July 12, 1846 the vast Archdiocese of Oregon City, including in it areas that the Bishop of St. Louis had always regarded as part of his diocese. The new province was a political hybrid; three of its seven subordinate sees were actually in Canadian territory, governed by a trio of French-Canadians. Blanchet at once selected his brother Augustin and his friend Modeste Demers to be his suffragans. A year later Rome raised St. Louis to an archdiocese as well.[58]

Without their previous knowledge, let alone advice and consent, Rome had done what the American bishops hesitated to do--begun the process of maximizing American ecclesiastical stratification. The New World prelates ridiculed the scheme, declaring it "too absurd to be put in execution," protested Propaganda's inept tutelage, and scorned Rome's "manufacturing the Archbishop of Oregon in Montreal [and] then the bishoprics."[59] They counseled Propaganda "to refer the affairs of this country to the recommendations and advice of the Provincial Council, since it was in departing from this way that grave errors had been committed." For any necessary extensions of the American hierarchy, they wrote, "domestic manufactures are in a state of prosperity."[60]

They intended this advice also to apply to Propaganda's approach to the organization of California Catholicism. In 1840, at the solicitation of the Mexican government, Rome made the Diocese of the Two Californias a suffragan to Mexico City. Following the death in 1846 of California's Bishop Garcia y Moreno, it appointed Father José Maria Gonzales Rubio as diocesan administrator. Two years later, however, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which closed the Mexican War, assigned Upper California and New Mexico to the United States. Spiritual jurisdiction in this territory therefore passed to the American hierarchy. The new boundary line between the United States and Mexico, however, remained unsettled, allowing Rubio's interim jurisdiction in the Southwest to last in fact until 1850.[61] Despite the temporary delay the boundary issue caused, Francis Blanchet, the rest of the hierarchy, and Rome all began making plans to secure property belonging to the Church before the cession and provide an ecclesiastical government for Upper California.

The struggle for effective control over California Catholicism began when Blanchet, acting as archbishop of the American ecclesiastical province nearest to that territory, suggested a plan to Rome that angered the rest of the American hierarchy. Blanchet reminded Propaganda that while Monterey was the present capital of California, and thus the logical site for the bishop's seat, San Francisco would likely continue to grow in importance; hence, the new bishop should be left free to designate that city as his episcopal see. In a second letter, this one to Pope Pius IX, Blanchet nominated two French-Canadian priests as candidates for bishop of the proposed diocese and requested that it be made subordinate to his Oregon archdiocese.[62]

"Newspaper intelligence" revealed this proposal, not long after the same source had incorrectly announced, to the consternation of the rest of the American hierarchy, the appointment of a French priest to be bishop of California. Bishop Michael Portier wanted to know why Propaganda was unaware of the fact that there already was a Mexican administrator (Rubio) in California. And Archbishop Samuel Eccleston, who was busy surveying the ideas of his colleagues concerning the California question, told Francis Kenrick that he was quite in the dark about the rumored French bishop. Unless the

XUM

reported appointee had "given evidence of an extraordinary vocation," Eccleston was inclined to believe the rumor was "apocryphal."[63]

Whether true or not, however, the American bishops refused to stay out of the California question. Agreeing on the necessity of appointing a bishop there, they sent individual solicitations to Rome for information on Propaganda's plans and to request that no action be taken on the appointment until the American hierarchy could discuss the issue at the impending Provincial Council of 1849.[64] In the meantime, with the support of his fellow-bishops, especially Francis Kenrick and John Hughes, Archbishop Eccleston conferred with U. S. Secretary of State James Buchanan. Buchanan suggested the bishops send a commission to California to survey the Catholic situation there, then issue a report that the government could use to insure proper titles to the property the Catholic Church had held before the cession.[65] Suspecting Propaganda was anxious to provide a bishop for California, Eccleston also asked his colleagues to send nominations to Rome. The bishop, he wrote, should be an American citizen who "if practicable" could speak the English language, possessed experience in the American mission, and had a previous "understanding with our government at Home."[66] John

Hughes, agreeing with Eccleston, also thought the new bishop should speak Spanish; but Michael O'Connor shrewdly warned that a native Spaniard might be offensive to the Mexican population in California.[67]

From the ensuing correspondence, it appeared that most bishops in the Baltimore Province wanted Father Charles Pius Montgomery, born and educated in Kentucky and experienced in the mission there, as the new Bishop of California.[68] If Rome agreed, as it finally did, to appoint Montgomery, the prelates were also anxious to prevent his assignment to the jurisdiction of Archbishop Blanchet. Accordingly they asked Rome to leave the juridic status of the new California See of Monterey as it had been before the peace (that is, subordinate to Mexico City), until the Provincial Council was prepared to suggest the creation of additional American provinces.[69] To cover the possibility of a Roman decision favoring Blanchet's plan and to contain future threats to American ecclesiastical unity, the hierarchy also asked the Holy Father to make Baltimore the primate province of the United States Church.[70] Sure that Propaganda had been disturbed by both the Monterey and the primacy requests, Bishop Anthony Blanc, commenting in February 1850 on Propaganda's delay in responding to

XUM

these proposals, suggested sarcastically that perhaps the American decrees had been placed "under the index."[71]

Six months later, however, the response arrived. In avoiding either of the alternatives, Propaganda declared itself not yet prepared to separate California church government into an American and Mexican sphere and unwilling to enlarge and further complicate the American/Canadian composition of Oregon Province. Instead, it made Monterey a simple diocese, immediately subject to the Holy See, thus temporarily avoiding the problem of its affiliation with either archbishopric. By refusing comment, Rome also avoided a decision on the primacy issue, reflecting its fear that the American church was already too strongly nationalistic.[72] Finally, because Montgomery refused the office, Rome appointed Joseph Sadoc Alemany Bishop of Monterey. The American hierarchy applauded this choice. After Montgomery's refusal some of its members had nominated Alemany, an American citizen with solid experience as a teacher and a priest in the United States.[73] The controversy ended two years later when, meeting in the First Plenary Council (1852), the American bishops suggested, and Rome accepted, the creation of the Archdiocese of San Francisco with Monterey as its suffragan see.[74]

Thus in their determination to direct the plans and the choice of episcopal leadership for an expanding church, the bishops had been remarkably successful. They selected the prelates of the Roman-created Archdiocese of St. Louis; they successfully resisted the grand Roman-French-Canadian concert (Oregon's subordinate sees located in the United States were suppressed in 1850); and they promoted their own scheme for the organization of California Catholicism over that of their nominal colleague, F. N. Blanchet.[75]

By 1852 the hierarchy had created a distinctively American church. Responding to the social and political climate of the United States and taking advantage of the immersion of the Roman Curia in European affairs and of the turbulent condition of American Catholicism, they developed both a theology and a set of procedures to order the relationships of the Roman Church to the Republic and of Papacy to episcopacy. Collectively they were devoted to the Pope, but their loyalty was a spiritual not a political one, as was general in Europe. While ready to appeal to the Pope to defend hierarchical authority over allegedly recalcitrant priests, lay trustees, and Propaganda, individual bishops divided over the issue of Papal infallibility. Yet the home-bred and collectively recognized bishop-theologians did develop a liberal theory of episcopal collegiality, to which all the bishops at one time or another paid at least lip service. This concept affected and in turn was influenced by the development of a strong practical tradition of united action. Certainly Rome's unwillingness to make the Archbishop of Baltimore the American primate attested to the hierarchy's effective institutionalization of its commitment to an integrative American church directly responsible to the Pope in spiritual matters.

In the years following Vatican I (1869), Rome--as already stated--centralized its control over the entire Catholic communion by defining and propagating the doctrine of Papal infallibility. Simultaneously, the Vatican greatly strengthened its hold over the United States church by establishing the Apostolic Delegation in 1893, despite protests from some American bishops. In words reminiscent of John Carroll and his successors, Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria remarked that "American Catholics are devoted to the Church. They recognize in the pope Christ's vicar and gladly receive from him doctrines of faith and morals. But for the rest, they ask him to interfere as little as may be."[76] Finally, after 1852, Rome increasingly reasserted its power to choose American prelates. Gradually a more heterogeneous Roman-molded American leadership came to replace the homogeneous American-bred hierarchy of the earlier period.

Notes

[1] Pope Pius VI was Napoleon's captive from 1789 to 1799. His successor, Pius VII, was an imperial prisoner for five years, from 1809 to 1814. In the Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana, there is a very reserved statement on the captivity of the Papacy.

[2] James F. Connolly, *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America, 1853-1854* (Rome, 1952).

[3] Quoted in Charles Wharton, *A Concise View of the Principal Points of Controversy Between Protestant and Roman Churches* (New York, 1817), 48, 49.

[4] Martin Spalding, "On the Infallibility of the Church," n.d., Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, NDA.

[5] Martin Spalding, "Influence of Catholicity on Civil Liberty" and "On the Primacy of the Pope," ibid.

[6] John England to Ambrose Maréchal, June 25, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland; England, "Infallibility of the Church," *The Works of the Rt. Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston*, ed. Sebastian Messmer (7 vols.; Cleveland, 1908), I, 6, 15.

[7] Quoted in James Hennesey, "A Prelude to Vatican I: American Bishops and the Definition of the Immaculate Conception," *Theological Studies*, XXV (September, 1964), 409-419; Francis Kenrick to Paul Cullen, October 12, 1837, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[8] Francis X. Weninger, a midwestern priest, in 1868 published a book entitled *On the Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Pope When Teaching the Faithful and of His Relation to a General Council*, in which he defended Papal infallibility.

[9] Benedict Fenwick accused John England of Gallicanism. See B. Fenwick to "Rev. dr. Father," July 22, 1829, Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus (MSJA), Baltimore, Maryland.

XUM

[10] Thomas Hanley, "Archbishop Carroll and the French Revolution," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXXI (September-December 1960), 67-72; England to Cullen, December 15, 1833, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; England to Simon Bruté, October 31, 1831, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky.

[11] B. Fenwick to "Rev. dr. Father," July 22, 1829, MSJA; John David to Bruté, February 28, 1833, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[12] David to Bruté, February 28, 1833, ibid.

[13] David to Bruté, May 11, 1834, ibid.

[14] *Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown* (Bardstown, Kentucky, 1825).

[15] Quoted in James Hennesey, *The First Council of the Vatican: The American Experience* (New York, 1963), 84.

[16] *National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919*, ed. Peter Guilday (Washington, 1923), 200; James Hennesey, "The Baltimore Council of 1866: An American Syllabus," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXXVI (1965), 162.

[17] Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1888* (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 184; *Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Totious Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori Habiti Anno 1852* (Baltimore, 1853), 7-64.

[18] Quoted in Michael Egan to Bruté, January 1, 1829, NDA. See also John Carroll to Charles Plowden, September 26, 1783, Department of Archives and MSS, Catholic University of America (CUA), Washington, D.C.; Stephen Badin to Edward Fenwick, December 9, 1823, NDA; and England to Bruté, June 9, 1827, ibid. The Acts of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 1817, ASN, includes a list of Propaganda's membership: Prefect Litta, Secretary Pedicini, Dugnani, Quarantolli, Pacca, and De Gregorio. Contrast Thomas F. Casey, *The Sacred Congregation De Propaganda Fide and the Revision of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1829-1830* (Rome, 1957), chap. vii.

XUM

[19] Carroll to Plowden, April 15, 1795, CUA. See Appendices C and D for lists of the bishops and American dioceses.

[20] Carroll told Plowden that when he made the nominations to Rome there was not one stable, trustworthy, or active priest available in New York. Carroll to Plowden, December 5, 1808, ibid.

[21] John Cheverus to Carroll, October 3, 1811, ibid.; Victor O'Daniel, "The Right Rev. Richard Luke Concanen, O.P., The First Bishop of New York (1747-1810)," Catholic Historical Review, I-II (January 1916), 400-421, 19-45; "Correspondence of Archbishop Carroll and the Irish Church," Catholic Historical Review, XV (December 1865), 123-138; Carroll to Joseph Plessis, October 15, 1810 and Carroll to Plowden, January 27, 1812, ibid.

[22] Quoted in Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, NDA; Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 72-77; Concilia Provincialia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849 (Baltimore, 1851), 25-28.

[23] Annabelle Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore, 1735-1815 (New York, 1955), 280.

[24] Cheverus to Maréchal, January 25, 1819, BCA.

[25] Peter Guilday, The Catholic Church in Virginia, 1815-1822 (New York, 1924), 116-117.

[26] Joseph Carriere to John Purcell, October 11, 1849, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[27] Cheverus to Maréchal, May 1, 1817, enclosing Cheverus to Cardinal Litta, April 25, 1817, BCA.

[28] England to E. Fenwick, September 18, 1832, Cincinnati Collection and England to Cullen, May 13, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; F. Kenrick to Cullen, March 30, 1834, February 14, 1837, American Catholic Historical Society Archives (ACHS), St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

[29] England to Maréchal, June 26, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA, Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA.

XUM

[30] Michael O'Connor to Cullen, July 16, 1846, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-1869, ibid.

[31] John Dubois to Purcell, December 28, 1831, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[32] John Dubourg to E. Fenwick, July 6, 1823, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[33] England to Maréchal, February 15, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA.

[34] Cheverus to Maréchal, April 15, 1817, ibid.; John Power to Maréchal, June 27, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 19n-p, ibid.

[35] Maréchal to William Gradwell, March 30, 1821, ACHS.

[36] Peter Guilday, "Trusteeism," *Historical Records and Studies* (New York, 1928), 7-73; Robert F. McNamara, "Trusteeism in the Atlantic States, 1785-1863," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXX (July 1944), 135-154.

[37] John Connolly to Maréchal, July 8, 1819, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 181m BCA; Robert F. McNamara, "Trusteeism," *Historical Records and Studies* (New York, 1928), 144.

[38] James Redmond to Maréchal, March 28, 1818, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 20q-t, ibid.

[39] Connolly to Maréchal, July 8, 1819 and Maréchal's Account to Propaganda, October 16, 1818, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 181m, ibid.

[40] B. Fenwick to Maréchal, December 19, 1820 and England to Maréchal, February, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, ibid.; Peter Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England, 1786-1845* (2 vols.; New York, 1927), I, chaps. vii and viii. Kelly never lived at Richmond. He stayed at Norfolk, inviting Carbry to administer in Richmond. Eventually the two had a falling-out, causing a violent factional split among Richmond's Irish Catholics.

[41] Maréchal to Gradwell, March 30, 1821, n.d., ACHS; William Poynter to Maréchal, October 3, June 6, and

July 30, 1821 and April 21, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 19m-p, BCA.

[42] Maréchal to Felix Gallagher, n.d., October 6, 1817, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Supplement to Box 21A, ibid. See also Leonard Neale to [John Connolly?], n.d., Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12R7, ibid.

[43] Georgetown College to Maréchal, November 3, 1820, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 20q-t, ibid.

[44] Maréchal went to Rome on October 14, 1821. The erection of Richmond Diocese had actually been premature, since Virginia had a small Catholic population that was concentrated in the coastal cities of Norfolk--where Kelly chose to reside--and Portsmouth. Kelly was translated to the Diocese of Waterford and Lismore, Ireland. Maréchal's successor, James Whitfield, tried to get Richmond reunited with the Archdiocese of Baltimore. At the Second Provincial Council in 1833 the bishops voted to request such from Rome. Rome refused. From the suppression of Richmond Diocese to its restoration in 1849, the Archbishop of Baltimore administered the area. When Richmond was restored, it was divided into two sees--Richmond and Wheeling.

[45] B. Fenwick to _____ Wallace, April 10, 1822, Archdiocesan Archives of Boston (AAB), Boston, Massachusetts.

[46] Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, NDA. Flaget wrote to Bruté, urging Bruté to write to him when he heard about the details of the 1812 "national council." Future Bishop Dubourg wrote to John Tessier, giving November 10 as the date for the 1812 council, as well as his reasons for leaving for Europe before the council was to meet. Flaget to Bruté, October 17, 1821, ibid.; Dubourg to Tessier, August 28, 1812, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[47] Guilday, *Councils of Baltimore*, 81-187; *Concilia Provincialia*, 31-307. There was a second Plenary Council in 1866 followed by a third in 1884. See Appendix B for ecclesiastical terminology regarding Church councils.

[48] Ibid., 81-100 and 31-106. Casey, *The Sacred Congregation*, vii, believes that Propaganda, at least with respect to its revision of this particular council's

XUM

anti-lay trusteeism decree, showed a "reasoned, dispassionate, impartial and well-balanced study of the Council with an apostolic concern for souls always evident."

[49] Propaganda to E. Fenwick, May 19, 1827, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA; John Conwell, Printed Document on Trustee Problems and Results, n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; Michael Egan to Bruté, January 1, 1829, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[50] Egan to Bruté, January 1, 1829, ibid.

[51] Purcell to Blanc, September 5, 1839, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[52] Ibid.; Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.; England to Cullen, June 23, 1836, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; Dubois to Purcell, July 2, September 29, 1835, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; David to James Whitfield, January 1827, St. Louis Archdiocesan Archives (SLA), St. Louis, Missouri.

[53] Purcell to Blanc, September 5, 1839, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[54] Bishops consecrated for non-European dioceses took an oath to render an account of their affairs to Rome, either in person or through a suitable deputy. American bishops tended to go to Europe frequently, feeling isolated from the Roman decision-making process and needing money, men, and supplies. See Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69 and Records of the English College, Rome, 1821-1834, ibid., for the voluminous correspondence between American prelates and their Roman agents, especially Paul Cullen, Tobias Kirby, William Poynter, and William Gradwell. Rome disapproved of the agency system. Ercole Consalvi, Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda, informed the American hierarchy, in a letter to E. Fenwick, that it had been the practice for "bishops having business with Sacred Congregation to send the matter directly to Sacred Congregation." But in America the "custom has grown of sending these matters through proxies, sometimes of private men and this the fathers of the Sacred Congregation do not approve." Hereafter all business--"doubts, recourses, and similar

XUM

matters must be sent directly to the Sacred Congregation." Consalvi to E. Fenwick, September 14, 1922, Detroit Collection, ibid.

[55] Appendices C and D display the development of a highly organized ecclesiastical structure.

[56] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 136, 139.

[57] The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence, ed. Francis Tourscher (Philadelphia, 1920), 263.

[58] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 154, 155.

[59] John Chanche to Anthony Blanc, July 16, August 1, October 15, 1846 and Michael Portier to Blanc, August 21, 1847, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[60] Portier to Blanc, August 21, 1847, ibid.

[61] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 154-167.

[62] F. N. Blanchet to Propaganda, June 1, 1849, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid. and F. N. Blanchet to Pius IX, June 10, 1849, ibid.

[63] Samuel Eccleston to F. Kenrick, January 3, 1849, BCA; Portier to Blanc, August 21, 1847, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[64] Eccleston to Propaganda, September 4, 1848, Scritture riferite nei Congressi America Centrale, ibid.; John Hughes to Eccleston, December 23, 1848, BCA.

[65] Robert M. Walsh to Eccleston, March 15, 1848, Hughes to Eccleston, December 23, 1848, and Eccleston to F. Kenrick, December 26, 1848 and December 27, 1848, ibid.

[66] Eccleston, Circular Letter to Members of the American Hierarchy, April 27, 1850 and Eccleston to F. Kenrick, December 16, 1848, ibid.

[67] Hughes to Don Jose de la Guerra y Noriega, December 12, 1848, quoted in Joseph A. Thompson, El Gran Capitan: Jose de la Guerra, a Historical

Biographical Study (Los Angeles, 1961), 221-225; O'Connor to Propaganda, April 27, 1850, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[68] Eccleston to Purcell, March 30, 1850, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; Purcell to Eccleston, April 3, 1850, Richard Miles to Eccleston, April 18, 1850, and Eccleston to Spalding, April 16, 1850, BCA; O'Connor to Propaganda, April 27, 1850, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[69] Propaganda to Eccleston, December 21, 1849, August 9, 1850, BCA; Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 161.

[70] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 161.

[71] Blanc to Purcell, February 6, 1850, ASN.

[72] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 161; National Pastorals, 181.

[73] Charles Montgomery to Eccleston, February 22, March 30, 1850, BCA; Eccleston to Propaganda, April 6, 1850, Martin Henni to Propaganda, April 30, 1850, Peter Kenrick to Propaganda, May 2, 1850, James Van deVelde to Propaganda, May 8, 1850, Blanc to Propaganda, May 9, 1850, and F. Kenrick to Propaganda, June 12, 1850, all in Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[74] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 171, 181.

[75] Ibid., 154-167; see Appendices C and D for lists of the bishops and American dioceses.

[76] David F. Sweeney, The Life of John Lancaster Spalding (New York, 1965), 213.

V. LAY TRUSTEEISM

The bishops found it relatively simple to order the relationship of the Roman Church to the American Republic and of the episcopacy to Papacy, compared to the complex situation they faced in organizing and governing their own church. Their thinking on both issues was influenced by and compatible with the political axioms of the new nation, tendencies of Catholic laymen, and relative isolation from Rome. And the resulting formulations did not challenge episcopal independence. Quite the contrary. If anything, the prelates' support of separation of church and state and of episcopal collegiality enhanced their power.

In the organization and administration of the American church, however, the episcopacy faced the intramural challenge of presbyterianism (in Catholic terminology, lay trusteeism). The hierarchy's insistence on its Constitutionally guaranteed right to maintain a traditional ecclesiastical polity so long as it owed no political loyalty to external powers, helped to define the dialogue between the bishops and the Republic, as already shown. On the other hand, whether and to what

XUM

extent the locus of authority--spiritual as well as political--should be in a body of bishops was one of the greatest sources of conflict within the American church itself.

Some American Catholics joined non-Catholics in questioning the legitimacy of traditional Catholic government in a democratic society. As American Catholics were divided into congregations rather than parishes, so the prelates--at least according to canonical theory--had a wide range of liberty in determining structural patterns. In practice, lay trustees or vestrymen, elected by pew-holders, were supposed to administer the economic and political affairs of these congregations, leaving all spiritual matters--such as appointments and dismissals of priests--to their clerics and bishops. As it evolved, however, the system was being translated into a program of presbyterianism against episcopacy. Trustees, supported by some or even none of the other members of their congregations, tended to extend their administrative authority to mixed temporal and spiritual matters and to leave for the clergy and hierarchy only the purely spiritual--specifically, administration of the sacraments. These usurpations ranged from such petty matters as directing the altar to be built in the wrong end of the church, because trustees thought it

XUM

looked better there, to the total exclusion of the clergy from any share in the economic administration of the congregation, and the claimed right to choose or eject their pastors (referred to as _jus patronatus_ or _jus nominandi_) or even their bishops. In the process, trustees often created a poor public image, sometimes came to physical blows with one another and their priests, occasionally brought costly and embarrassing civil suits against dissenting laymen, clerics, and prelates, and even caused the arrest of at least one priest--Gabriel Richard.[1]

Sometimes this quest for presbyterian independence was defended as justified by various foreign practices, those of Gallicanism, or of the Spanish _real patronato_, or of the _marquilliers_--French and German. Despite the belief of the immigrants themselves that they were merely recreating homeland religious styles, these systems were not the real models for trusteeist political action. Theoretically they could not be. Whatever the differences between them, each practice represented the Roman Church's accommodation in the administration of its national communions to politics in Europe, where the extremes of union and violent separation of altar and throne were the rule. Simply, Rome exchanged with every Catholic civil authority certain privileges, like

XUM

episcopal nomination, for political and economic support. In America, of course, such an arrangement was unconstitutional, one of the reasons the bishops won the quasi-legal privilege of selecting their own colleagues. Actually, trustees used these European systems primarily as ex post facto arguments in favor of a viewpoint clearly indigenous to American Catholicism, with its roots in the Colonial period. Political democracy, not any foreign ideology or practice, inspired this distinctive and widespread American Catholic presbyterian phenomenon. Of course, once laymen gained political power the spiritual decisions they made--like where the altar should be built--were indeed closely related to European ethno-cultural religious traditions.

Certainly the American character of Catholic presbyterianism was clear when the trustees of the Norfolk, Virginia, congregation voted to deny the authority of Archbishop Ambrose Maréchal. Naturally they argued that his actions had not been "consonent [_sic_] with ecclesiastical laws" and Church traditions.[2] It was therefore the Archbishop and not the trustees who had shown a "stubborn schesmatical [_sic_]contumacy." But Maréchal's actions were also not "consonant with vital principles which form the basis of our social compact . . . the political union of these United States." Since Maréchal

XUM

had not been "requested, voted for or acknowledged by this congregation," and he had "acted towards us rather like the chief of a party, than as a mild Christian pastor, [he] is from this, rejected by the congregation as unworthy of being our prelate."[3] Immediately thereafter the Norfolk faction joined their Charleston, South Carolina, counterpart in petitioning Rome to create a new southeastern see, consisting of all the Archdiocese of Baltimore south of Maryland, hopefully administered by an Irish-born prelate. When he wrote to Rome in 1818, Maréchal correctly identified civil libertarianism as the primary motivation behind such movements. He told Rome that

> the American people clings with the most ardent love to the civil liberty it enjoys. Again it is a primary principle of civil liberty among them, that absolutely all magistrates, whether high or low, at stated times of the year should be elected by popular vote. Likewise all sects of Protestants, by the same principles and accordingly elect and dismiss, at their pleasure, their pastors. Now the Catholics living in their society are evidently exposed to the danger of admitting the same principles of ecclesiastical rule, and by the artifices of impious priests, who cater to their pride, are easily led to believe they have the right to elect and dismiss their pastors as they please.[4]

He could have added that state laws incorporating congregations in the name of lay trustees, and like legal provisions for church organization, provided the practical impetus to democratic inclinations. In the United States such provisions were simply legal extensions of religious voluntarism. They more or less followed the Protestant tradition of post-Reformation English law that refused to consider the Church as a corporation and would incorporate only specific groups of churchmen.[5] If strictly interpreted, the broad electoral and administrative powers these civil laws conferred upon congregations and trustees could completely subvert Catholic episcopal authority and the canon law of administration. As early as 1786, John Carroll realized the dangers inherent in a Catholic presbyterianism, despite his own personal proclivities in that direction. He believed that

> if ever the principles [of exclusive trustee incorporation] then laid down should become predominant, the unity and catholicity of our Church would be at an end; and it would be formed into distinct and independent societies, nearly in the same manner as the congregational Presbyterians of our neighboring New England States.[6]

Although state legislation differed, making it always very difficult for the bishops to form precise regulations on property tenure uniformly applicable throughout the nation, most states had some type of trustee incorporation law.

In the Northeast, Catholic laymen freely joined with Know Nothings in the 1850's to support laws making trustee incorporation obligatory. In New York the result was the Putnam Bill of 1855. It provided that Catholic churches had to incorporate in accordance with the trustee incorporation law, under penalty of escheatment to the state of property handed down in any other way. Within two years similar measures had been successfully sponsored in Pennsylvania by Catholic trustees of Holy Trinity congregation and in Connecticut and Vermont by Know Nothings. The Massachusetts legislature, however, voted down compulsory trusteeism, reflecting the system's threat to all traditional forms of religious authority--Protestant as well as Catholic.[7] This flood of obligatory trustee legislation came on the heels of the defeat of the John Hughes-supported Taber Bill (1853). If passed, this bill would have made it possible for New York State bishops to hold church property as corporations sole.[8] At least in the Northeast the political dimension of so-called anti-Catholic nativism was a counterclaim to Catholic episcopal initiatives, whatever else it may have been. And, of all things, some of the alleged victims--predominantly Irish Catholic laymen--united with the "enemy" in issuing the rejoinder.

In the West the bishops also had to contend with analagous presbyterian tendencies, especially from laymen who had emigrated there from the East; but property tenure systems differed somewhat, for various reasons.

In the Middle West church incorporation laws, although similar to those in the Northeast, did not make lay trusteeism obligatory. This helps explain why early missionaries as well as laymen challenged episcopacy for effective control of that region's church government. Bardstown was the first midwestern diocese, its boundaries including--in addition to the blue grass country--Tennessee and the Northwest Territory.[9] Stephen Badin, one of the earliest and most influential missionaries to the colonies, was appointed by Carroll as vicar-general of this vast area before it became a diocese in 1808 under Benedict Flaget.[10] Unlike his Eastern colleagues, Badin was personally opposed to any degree of participatory democracy in church government.[11] He therefore immediately began a campaign for the investiture of property in the name of church officials in the Midwest while Carroll and his associates were sincerely trying to accommodate the same phenomenon in the East. In the process Badin used various techniques, among them persuasion. Publicly "redressing" his communicants for their misconceptions about the holding of ecclesiastical property, he accused them of being influenced by the "wealthier men, who were but few, but whose connections,

XUM

feeling, influence or dependence [sic] . . . possibly espouse their pretension to own church property." Bardstowners believed the speech was much too harsh.[12] Yet they bought and "piously" gave many acres of land to the church, with the title of ownership put under the name of the Vicar-General. Why? Primarily because Badin threatened to refuse to administer the sacraments to "popularly" owned congregations. Although we do not know about the spirituality of the "average" Catholic, this suggests a deep commitment to orthodox religious ministrations, at least to sacramental traditionalism. Certainly laymen desired to appoint and dismiss pastors and even bishops. But the appointees were almost useless without orthodox religious faculties. What good was a Catholic congregation without legitimate religion?[13] Badin's tactics, which he labeled "firm," Carroll and like-minded readers initially rejected as those of an unimaginative "rigorist."[14] Clearly Badin could not understand American conditions. When the time came to appoint a bishop to Bardstown, Carroll bypassed the Vicar-General, selecting instead the more flexible and likeable Benedict Flaget.[15] Undaunted, Badin vowed he would "never surrender . . . the rights and independence of the Church."[16] And he meant it, as Flaget soon discovered.

Owning or controlling an extensive amount of "church" land in and around Bardstown, Badin more so than the laity became Flaget's main antagonist in the struggle for effective control of the church in the new diocese. When he arrived in Bardstown, Flaget asked Badin to transfer all church property to him. The two disagreed upon the terms of transfer: Flaget wanted none, believing his office sufficient guarantee that all conditions or debts on the land would be fulfilled; Badin demanded special stipulations to reimburse him for any debts he had incurred and to uphold any and all conditions under which he had originally accepted the land. For years the issue went unsettled, despite the interference of mutual friends. Flaget recorded in his diary the "extremely painful conversations, indifferent conversations, and partial reconciliations," he had with Badin.[17] Finally in 1812 the two estranged compatriots traveled to Baltimore to argue their points before the impending Provincial Council. They arrived to discover the council had been indefinitely postponed, so they appealed to Carroll for assistance in settling the dispute. The results proved unsatisfactory.[18] Weary and disgusted, Flaget threatened to excommunicate Badin, telling Rome he could no longer "suffer . . . such conduct." Actually the bishop never executed this desire, fearing that

Badin's friends might break into "open rebellion . . . stirring up great scandal and perhaps breaking into schism." Instead, in 1816 Flaget used one of the prelates' favorite pre-1829 tactics; he appealed the case to the Pope. The bishop won the battle--Rome turned the property over to him, relieving Badin from any liabilities or conditions. He also won the war--Badin resigned from the Kentucky mission.[19]

In the Southwest and Far West, where foreign legal traditions--especially in the old French and Spanish districts--further complicated the story of church incorporation, the hierarchy usually applied John Timon's property tenure model. Timon, American-born and -trained protégé of the midwestern bishops, was personally acquainted with the "evils" of state-pensioned Catholicism in France and lay trusteeism in America. He opposed both extremes.[20] Timon used the theory of religious freedom to preclude both systems in the Republic of Texas. Operating on the assumption that post-revolutionary civil authorities in the Republic should not control pre-revolutionary church lands, he used his influence to get the Texas Congress to pass a bill giving the "Chief Pastor of the Roman Catholic Church," in trust for the eternal use and benefit of the Catholic religion, all pre-revolutionary property owned by the Catholic Church.

Yet, by avoiding verbs that carried any suggestion of largesse, the congressmen had not conferred on Timon a beneficiary title to holdings in the gift of the Republic.[21] Nevertheless, they had made it possible for Texas bishops to hold church property as corporations sole, eliminating at least political sanctions for state or popular control.

Probably the most difficult problem the American prelates had to solve, presbyterianism definitely caused the most dissension among them. In 1808 Vicar-General Badin actually accused Carroll and his fellow-bishops of introducing "Calvinistical" principles in the government of the church, because they accepted lay control of temporalities. Annoyed with the "extravagant pretensions of republicanism as consecrated in the Kentucky constitution," Badin warned Carroll that such pretensions "bordered on Jacobinism." If unchecked, they would in the hands of "haughty and nominal Catholics" make a victim of religion in Kentucky and "many other parts of the globe."[22] Chafing under the "liberality" of his own bishop, Flaget, Badin wrote to Propaganda protesting the American hierarchy's republican ideas and actions.[23] Richard Martial, another early midwestern missionary and vicar-general, agreed with Badin. He likewise reported to Propaganda an excess of republicanism in the Bardstown

XUM

Diocese. To begin with, Flaget traveled on horseback without his habit, and the priests wore short coats, white stockings, and white cravats. Even more startling, Flaget used "republican or democratic" methods in administering his diocese, especially the seminary and college. Martial thought it was "good and laudable" for a bishop to take counsel, but completely out of place for him to "collect votes and decide according to number." Such repugnant notions as these the "young clerics have sucked almost with the milk."[24]

The men in the hierarchy would not, and of course could not, accept Badin's and Martial's extreme positions. Their immediate response was to deny the two missionaries membership in the hierarchy.[25] But this did not solve the larger problem. The bishops were trying desperately to find some happy medium between traditional Roman ecclesiastical and inherited American presbyterian polities. This was not a simple matter. Given their backgrounds and training, almost all prelates were inclined toward some degree of democratization in the decision-making process. Such a predisposition was both compatible with American religious voluntarism and preferred by Catholic communicants; since Colonial times Catholics had shared the Yankee Protestant characteristic of conceptualizing a tension between liberty and authority.

Philosophy aside, the bishops also knew that if they accepted lay trusteeism their church would appear politically much less subversive to non-Catholics. And they also believed that, if properly confined to temporal matters, lay trustees could perform the positive service of freeing the hierarchy from political and economic entanglements. Such involvements had corrupted and weakened the Church in Europe, often making it a pawn in the hands of civil governments. The American prelates therefore wanted to confine themselves, as they insisted the Pope should do, to propagating the true spiritual mission of the Church. They longed to follow an ethic of ultimate rather than mere political responsibility, in common with their Protestant evangelical counterparts.[26] In the words of Bishop John Hughes, Carroll had instituted and authorized the system of lay trustees in Catholic congregations because he wished to "assimilate, as far as possible, the . . . administration of Catholic Church property in a way that would harmonize with the democratic principles on which the new government was founded." Regarded _a priori_, such a system was unobjectionable. Actually it was beneficial: securing advantages to Catholic congregations; allaying Protestant

XUM

anti-Catholicism; relieving priests from the "necessity and painfulness" of having to appeal from the pulpit for money to support themselves and to provide for the physical maintenance of churches and general welfare of congregations; securing church property, by the protection of the law, for the perpetual use of the Catholic communion; and binding in union the people and the clergy. In practice, however, the reverse seemed to be occurring. As the Catholic population became more ethnoculturally heterogeneous and trustees attempted to assert a greater degree of spiritual independence, the system had become, said Hughes, the "bitter chalice" of Carroll's old age.[27] Certainly it was an albatross around the collective neck of Carroll's successors.

From the creation of the hierarchy until the First Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829, the bishops' responded to presbyterianism through personal and unilateral diplomacy, domestic and foreign. Rather successful in dealing with the governments of vestrymen in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, and curbing their activities in Norfolk and Charleston, John Carroll and the Select Body of the Clergy declined comment on the question at their meeting in 1791.[28] This proved to be a notable and significant silence that carried over into the hierarchy's first meeting in 1810, when every other aspect of Catholic life was discussed.[29] Viewing the system as theoretically compatible to American democracy and Catholic dictates, Carroll and his new suffragans--Leonard Neale, Michael Egan, John Cheverus, and Benedict Flaget--seemed willing to accept it if it neither subverted their spiritual authority nor led to the erection of schismatical congregations, ethno-cultural or otherwise. Dispersing to their individual sees, each bishop began to develop his own style for coping with presbyterianism. Similar in many ways, stylistic differences reflected individual temperaments, feelings of security, and almost jealous protection of episcopal liberty or diocesan hegemony.

In the Midwest Flaget's concerns were not limited to wresting control of church property from Badin. Government by laymen prevailed in the then most populous and wealthy congregation in Kentucky, Scott City.[30] The new bishop accepted this arrangement. Like Carroll and John Cheverus of Boston, Flaget was an excellent grass-roots pastor: his clergy and communicants came to have a respect for and loyalty to him. Influenced by John David's belief that Félicité de Lamennais's ideas about liberty, while unfitted to France, were suited to the United States, Flaget tried to use democratic methods in administering his seminary and in his relations with

XUM

diocesan priests. He was the first American prelate to institute the practice of holding frequent diocesan meetings or synods, originally suggested by the conciliar fathers in 1810. Undoubtedly the synods were a means by which the new bishop could effectively consolidate the decision-making process. After all, the primary purpose of these meetings was to create uniform religious practice and discipline throughout the large diocese. Yet a real sense of participation did develop, since Flaget not only allowed his priests to vote on all questions, but legislated accordingly. Unanimity on issues and an esprit de corps among Bardstown clergy resulted. In turn, the priests translated synodal legislation into positive episcopal-clerical-lay relations.[31]

When Scott City Catholics began to quarrel among themselves about division and use of church property, portending a schism, Flaget employed his abilities as a flexible and liberal pastor. He personally visited the troubled congregation in the capacity of arbitrator. From his vantage point, the contending factions were irreconcilable; thus he suggested the conflict might best be resolved if the disputants would agree to allow him to manage their property. Unable to reach a satisfactory settlement among themselves, the laymen finally

XUM

consented. They accepted the bishop's offer, empowering him to appoint an agent. In return Flaget agreed never to sell the congregations' property without the communicants' approval. Rather than appointing an independent agent to administer Scott City temporalities, he established a joint lay-clerical board, with popular election of lay members.[32] In so doing, he managed to maintain a degree of participatory democracy, avoiding the use of spiritual coercion--recall of clerical faculties and interdiction of congregations or excommunication of individuals. His grass-roots support, along with his healthy self-confidence, accounted in large part for this success.

Meanwhile, in the Northeast most bishops tended to follow the lead of Leonard Neale, Carroll's successor as Archbishop of Baltimore. Neale's incumbency began with a continuation of his predecessor's practice of accepting political and economic presbyterianism.[33] He told the troublesome Norfolk trustees that he would be amenable to any "mode" they might adopt to represent their point of view on nonspiritual issues and to assure themselves that the bishop would never be able to "alienate the church property or turn it to his own use. . . ."[34] When the trustees rejected a priest, James Lucas, that Neale had appointed to their congregation, the archbishop tried pastoral persuasion. Certainly his appeal for a gentleman's agreement was conditioned by social and political necessity. It was also, however, a positive throwback to his earlier Maryland experience, when Anglo-American laymen had administered congregations in quiet, unpretentious, untroublesome ways. To recapture the days before Catholic ethnic pluralism and American democratic practices, when a relatively homogeneous and cultured constituency lacked any important internal conflict, was nostalgic longing. Now the hierarchy had to deal with a system of lay government that was here to stay, or so Neale believed. He therefore introduced a post-Carroll political twist by insisting upon mixed clerical and lay boards of trustees. Unlike Flaget, the unpersonable and uncreative Neale demanded that lay members be appointed by priests, not elected by congregations. And he used, necessarily rather hesitantly, the spiritual sanctions of recall of clerical faculties, interdiction, and excommunication.[35] As stubborn as their archbishop, the Norfolk faction would not be easily intimidated. Its members reminded Neale that he and his predecessor had bestowed upon popularly elected vestrymen the "trust of power" over church temporalities.[36]

The haggling over terms of episcopal-presbyterian accommodation continued, then actually worsened. For almost a decade, beginning in 1814, the pendulum of power in the American church seemed to be swinging toward presbyterianism. This period of confusion, characterized by almost unrelenting and unpredictable factional realignments, possessed one constant: Irish trustees or communicants trying to oust their vestrymen, priests, or bishops and gain control for themselves began looking to Rome for support.[37] They warned Propaganda that unless they had bishops who understood them, namely compatriots, Irish laymen would create a schismatic and independent church in the United States.[38] As usual, Archbishop Maréchal, Neale's successor, was on target when he accused "Irish Adventurer" priests and their lay supporters of using American liberties to create an Irish National Church in the United States.[39] At best confused, Rome responded from 1814 to 1820 by appointing five Irishmen--Luke Concanen, John Connolly, Henry Conwell, John England, and Patrick Kelly--to the American hierarchy, as discussed previously.

Quite naturally the new Roman-appointees sided with the Irish presbyterian factions, at least until experience in the new mission and pressures from their American-chosen counterparts either convinced them otherwise or destroyed them. Only Concanen, who died in transit, escaped controversy. As soon as Connolly

XUM

arrived in his New York Diocese he began campaigning among the other bishops and Propaganda's membership for the adoption of the Norfolk-Charleston scheme--a separate southeastern diocese with Irishman Thomas Carbry as prelate. The American-chosen bishops wanted a new diocese in South Carolina with their man, Benedict Fenwick, as bishop. But they opposed a Virginia See, primarily because it portended a schismatic and independent church. Connolly and the presbyterians appeared to win the first round, when Rome not only created the dioceses of Charleston, South Carolina and Richmond, Virginia, but appointed Irish bishops John England and Patrick Kelly to those sees. Until Kelly had a falling out with an influential Virginia faction, he likewise supported the Roman diplomacy of the presbyterians against the American-chosen bishops.[40] Standing firm, the native bishops, led by Maréchal, simply refused to recognize the authority of Kelly. Coupled with Kelly's waning popularity with his constituency, the hierarchy's united stand led Rome to translate him to Ireland and to suppress Richmond Diocese, at least temporarily. Death in 1825 saved Connolly from an analogous fate.

Similarly, John England's personal diplomacy created further divisiveness. On the domestic front, England initially supported his Charleston communicants' demands for more democracy.[41] It was not long, however, before he recognized the important difference between Catholic independent tendencies in the United States and Ireland. The one were presbyterian, the other, episcopal-directed Gallicanism. Stunned to discover that Irish-American demands for compatriot bishops actually camouflaged anti-episcopal proclivities, the transplanted Irish democrat flatly said, "I will have no lay trustees." Order the clergy to cease from officiating in trustee churches until the titles are given over to the bishops, he advised his colleagues.[42] To achieve this in his own diocese, England drew up and put into effect a "Constitution for the Roman Catholic Church for the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia."[43] Often referred to as innovative and liberal, it was actually little more than a sophisticated codification of Flaget's version of Neale's mixed clerical-lay boards of trustees, or quasi-politicized episcopacy, since popular election of vestrymen was provided for. It worked in England's diocese in large part because, in common with Flaget and Cheverus, he was a popular prelate. Of course, he was Irish, like the majority of his communicants. Something more than ethno-cultural compatibility, however, was necessary to keep the laity loyal, proof being Kelly's and Conwell's predicaments with compatriot trustees in

Virginia and Philadelphia. If any prelate had those extraordinary qualities, England certainly did. Young, handsome, brilliant, dynamic, the man was a natural leader. Even adversaries such as Maréchal respected him.[44]

How then could England's diplomacy possibly be divisive? Clearly he was moving an obstinate laity rather quietly away from presbyterianism toward traditional episcopacy, as Flaget and Cheverus were doing. But it was not what England wanted but how he went about getting it that caused such dissension. Insistent upon nationalizing his diocesan constitution, he used Roman diplomacy in an attempt to enforce episcopal compliance. England asked Propaganda to force the American hierarchy into a council for the purpose of promulgating the Charleston Constitution in every diocese.[45] It was one thing if an "insider" appealed to Rome, quite another if an "outsider" did. Every time an individual or faction had bypassed the native bishops and complained directly to Rome, the threat of political domination over the American church from above (Propaganda) and below (laymen and clerics) had resulted.

Certainly this is what happened with the Charleston and Norfolk developments. The fires Connolly fanned in those cities had spread to New York and Philadelphia.

And England also had been involved, initially joining Connolly and Kelly in support of presbyterian factions in both cities.[46] Conwell, himself one of Rome's Irishmen, found himself in the middle of perhaps the most infamous presbyterian episode in the history of the American church--the so-called Hogan Schism. He complained that England encouraged the libertarianism of the Philadelphia Hoganites. With England's support, the Reverend William Hogan could appeal to those "democrats" who held that in republican America "the bishops have not, nor ought not to have Power beyond what Presbyterians have."[47]

Dubois of New York, likewise plagued with "unruly" trustees, goaded on by priests "unfamiliar with the culture and customs of America," agreed. Dubois conceded that lay trusteeism was reasonable in theory and in many respects advantageous in practice; and he admired England's constitution. In the hands, however, of inexperienced men "inflated by false ideas of liberty" and considering themselves representatives of the popular interests--when they were often elected by small cliques of pew-holders--he was sure the laws of the internal government of the church were being subverted. England had to understand, Dubois reasoned, that in "pretending" to yield obedience to the bishop and clergy in spiritual matters lay trustees, under the "plea that their consciences would not permit them to pay the money of the Congregation to persons unacceptable to them," endeavored to interfere "in the appointment of clergymen, and to force such a priest as they became attached to, upon the bishop."[48] Such meddling earned England the lasting hatred of Conwell as well as Dubois's temporary distrust.[49] Both men more or less blamed England for their own inabilities to hold out against presbyterianism.[50] England later confessed that his actions were a mistake resulting from his unfamiliarity with the real issues.[51] This was little consolation, since Conwell and Dubois lost the support of their fellow-bishops and effective control of their dioceses primarily because they succumbed to demands of trustees whose cause England had once championed.

Amidst these troubles, the American-chosen bishops decided to support Archbishop Maréchal's diplomacy. Before taking his case to Rome, England had more than once urged Maréchal to convene a council to settle the issue of presbyterianism, with approval from a few other bishops like Flaget.[52] On the one hand, Maréchal may have refused because he was insecure as archbishop and disliked England. Even before England's American arrival, the correspondence between the two men had approached hostility.[53] After England joined the hierarchy, the temperaments and personalities of the two became increasingly incompatible. Aloof, cultivated, and rigidly pious, Maréchal had not wanted to leave his academic position at St. Mary's Seminary to be Archbishop of Baltimore.[54] Brash and aggressive, England longed for episcopal advancement.[55] Personalities aside, Conwell had convinced Maréchal that with England's help the Philadelphia presbyterian faction planned to take control of the council. Rumor had it that England was going to sponsor a Hoganite conciliar proposal to rescind Conwell's episcopal power. Of course, the bishops never would have accepted such a plan. But even a threat that audacious schismatics might demand this kind of hearing was sufficient reason for Maréchal to postpone an episcopal assembly.[56]

When the archbishop thought the threat had passed he at last began making plans for a council, but it was too late.[57] England had already commited himself to the Roman venture. To a certain extent then, Maréchal was responsible for England's "treason." Nevertheless, England became the culprit. His colleagues viewed both England's foreign and domestic diplomacy as unpardonable. Despite his later prominence in the hierarchy, these earlier actions negatively affected all his future proposals, regardless of merit.[58] The *coup de grâce* to England's well-meaning if rash activities came when in 1834 his colleagues refused to make him Archbishop of Baltimore.[59]

Always rejecting or at least revising in accordance with their own desires any Roman initiative, the American bishops temporarily dismissed the idea of a council. Instead, they sent Maréchal to Rome to argue the case for episcopacy before Propaganda and ultimately the Pope. Maréchal convinced Rome that the hierarchy and not intermeddling laymen, priests, or foreign-selected bishops knew what was best for the American church. Rome tacitly consented to allow the hierarchy the privilege of nominating its own membership, recalled Kelly, and suppressed Richmond Diocese. The pendulum of power swung once again toward episcopacy.

Notes

[1] Leonard Neale to James Lucas, April 1816, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland; John Conwell to Ambrose Maréchal, April 20, 1821, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, ibid.; Anthony Blanc to John Purcell, March 2, 1850, Cincinnati Collection, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana; Francis Kenrick to Propaganda, December 11, 1823, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.; Julius M.D. Somalia to Edward Fenwick, July 1, 1826, Detroit Collection, ibid.; John Hughes to Purcell, February 24, 1838, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; John England to Paul Cullen, June 23, 1836, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; Hughes's letter on the state of religion in the Diocese of New York in 1841, in The Complete Works of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D., ed. Lawrence Kehoe (2 vols; New York, 1865), I, 442.

[2] Oliviera Fernandez, Secretary of the Board of Trustees to the Roman Catholic Congregation of Norfolk, statement of June 25, 1818, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Supplement to Box 21A, BCA.

[3] Fernandez, statements of June 20 and June 25, 1818, ibid.

[4] Maréchal's Account to Propaganda, October 16, 1818, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 181m, ibid.

[5] Patrick J. Dignan, A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States (New York, 1935), 49, 52-54.

[6] Carroll to the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church [St. Peters] of the City of New York, January 25, 1786, BCA.

[7] Dignan, Church Property, 198-200, 210; Frederick H. Zwierlein, The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid (3 vols.; Rochester, New York, 1925-1927), I, 208-210; Ray Allen Billington, The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860 (New York, 1938), 416; William Byrne, et al., History of the Catholic Church in the New England States (2 vols.; Boston, 1899), I, 68.

[8] Hughes's Circular Letter of March 16, 1852, Kehoe, Complete Works, II, 719.

[9] In 1785 sixty Catholic families, including friends and relatives of John Carroll, from St. Mary's, Charles, and Prince George Counties, Maryland, migrated to Kentucky, settling in Bardstown. By 1820 Bardstown was the center of western Catholicity.

[10] Badin was a French emigré who had come to Baltimore in 1792 while still a seminarian. Completing his studies at the Sulpician seminary there, he was the first priest to be ordained in America. Carroll to Stephen Badin, March 18, 1801, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[11] Benedict Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., 14r-16r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA; Badin to Carroll, February 17, 1807, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, BCA.

[12] Badin told Carroll that he and Charles Nerinckx, a Belgian priest who assisted Badin, were thinking of retiring, because they no longer got along well with the people. Badin to Carroll, February 17, 1807, ibid.

[13] Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., 14r-16r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[14] Carroll to Badin, March 18, 1801 and Badin to Carroll, April 13, 1808, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[15] Badin to Carroll, February 9, 17, 1807, March 10, April 30, June 18, November 4, 1808, ibid. Badin told Edward Fenwick that he had been attacked as "an ambitious priest who aimed at being co-adjutor of Bardstown instead of Monseignor David." Badin was always attacking members of the hierarchy. He accused Bishop Frederick Résé of "duplicity" in respect to the affairs of his diocese. Badin to E. Fenwick, December 9, 1823, April 27, 1827 and Badin to Purcell, October 13, 1836, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[16] Badin to Carroll, April 13, 1808, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[17] Judge James Twyman, friend to both men, tried to mediate the issue. John David told Simon Bruté about the irritation between Badin and Flaget and of his futile attempts to alleviate it. Flaget's Diary, entries of August 17-20, 1811, Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, NDA; David to Bruté, January 9, March 10, 1812, ibid.

[18] Martin Spalding, *Sketches of the Life and Times, and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget* (Louisville, Kentucky, 1852), chap. v.

[19] Flaget's Report to Pius VII on the Condition of the Diocese of Bardstown, April 10, 1815, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky.

[20] Timon studied under Bruté at Mt. St. Mary's and Joseph Rosati at St. Mary-of-the-Barrens Seminary, Perry County, Missouri. These men, as well as Bishops Leo de Neckere and John Odin, shaped Timon's course with care. In 1835 Rosati, Bruté, and Dubois all petitioned Rome to name Timon as coadjutor to their dioceses. Guy Chabrat told Propaganda that Flaget wanted Timon as Coadjutor to Bardstown, following the resignation of Chabrat, who had become blind. Chabrat to Propaganda, September 25, 1847, 602r to v, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA.

[21] H.P.N. Gammel, comp., *The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897* (Texas, 1898), II, 492; Timon to Blanc, April 28, 1841, New Orleans Collection, ibid.

[22] Badin to Carroll, April 13, 1808, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[23] Badin to Propaganda, n.d., 741r to 742v, Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., 14r-16v, and April 10, 1851, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, NDA; Flaget's Diary for 1812, Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, ibid.; David to Bruté, January 9, March 10, 1812, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[24] Richard Martial to Propaganda, n.d., Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[25] Badin to Carroll, February 9, 17, 1807, March 10, April 30, June 18, November 4, 1808, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA; Badin to E.

XUM

Fenwick, December 9, 1823, April 27, 1827, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; Badin to Purcell, October 13, 1836, ibid.

[26] Max Weber, "Politics As A Vocation," H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York, 1958), 115. See Ronald Formisano, The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861 (Princeton, 1971), chap. iv, for a discussion of how this relates to evangelical Protestantism.

[27] Hughes on Trusteeism, Kehoe, Complete Works, II, 550, 551.

[28] Peter Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884 (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 63; Concilia Provincialia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849 (Baltimore, 1851), 11-24.

[29] Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, NDA.

[30] Spalding, Sketches, 247.

[31] Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, ibid.; Flaget's first diocesan conference was held on February 20, 1812. In September 1822, Flaget decreed that the diocesan priests should meet in annual spiritual retreats, followed by conferences on various subjects connected with the exercise of the ministry. Flaget lived at the seminary during part of his incumbency, where he developed an intimate relationship with his future priests. Flaget's Diary, February 1812, Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-1867, ibid.

[32] Flaget told the trustees of St. Anne Congregation, Detroit, that "the people of Bardstown [that is, Scott City], not less jealous of their prerogatives than those of Detroit, . . . submitted with little difficulty" to a joint lay-clerical board, with ownership of property in the Bishop's name. Flaget to St. Anne's Trustees, July 1, 1817, Detroit Collection, ibid.

[33] See Archbishop Neale's Papers, especially Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[34] L. Neale to James Lucas, March 26, 1817, ibid.

[35] L. Neale to Lucas, April 19, July 5, 1816, January 14, 1817, ibid.; Norfolk Trustees to Lucas and L. Neale, May 6, 1816, ibid.; "To the Members of the Roman Catholic Congregation of Norfolk; Or a Short Exposition of Their Rights as well as of the Facts (which have taken place from the last of December 1815 to the present date), Aiming at the Total Infraction, and Full Usurpation of the Same, by the Reverend J. Lucas, Appointed Pastor by the Most Reverend L. Neale, Archbishop of Baltimore at their Meeting in December 1815, Held at the House of E. Higgins, Esq., Treasurer Of The Board," signed by John Donaghey, Bernard Mulholland, Eugene Higgins, and Jasper Moran, December 21, 1816, ibid. Dr. Oliviera Fernandez, Spanish-born secretary of the lay board of trustees, was probably the author of this lengthy document.

[36] Norfolk Trustees to Lucas and L. Neale, May 6, 1816, ibid.

[37] A January 2, 1809 list of the Norfolk pew-holders, ibid., shows that 75 per cent were Irish-born.

[38] Norfolk "Petition to the Holy See," and "Instructo" to John Donaghey and Jasper Moran, June 1817, ibid.

[39] Maréchal to William Gradwell, March 30, 1821, American Catholic Historical Society Archives (ACHS), St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; William Poynter to Maréchal, June 6, 1821, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 19m-p, BCA.

[40] Walter DeLacy to Maréchal, June 10, 1821, Lucas to Maréchal, January 21, 1821, Nicholas Kearney to Maréchal, June 9, 1820, March 18, 1821, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, ibid.; Patrick Kelly to _____ Magagnos, June 7, 23, 1821, and Magagnos to Kelly, June 19, 27, 1821, ibid.; Diurnal of Bishop John England, June 4, 30, 1821, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA.

[41] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, ibid.; England to Maréchal, October 2, 1820, March 7, 1821 Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; Conwell to Maréchal, June 6, 1824, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, 14c, ibid.

[42] England to Maréchal, March 7, 1821, December 22, 1822, January 15, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, ibid.

XUM

[43] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; Conwell to Maréchal, June 6, 1824, December 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA; Conwell to Maréchal, July 2, 1825, Box 15c,d, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, ibid.; England to Maréchal, January 15, 1823, March 3, December 17, 1824, n.d., 1825, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Maréchal, n.d., ACHS.

[44] England to Maréchal, February 15, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; Hughes to Samuel Eccleston, December 5, 1842, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, ibid.; J. McGerry to Cullen, September 15, 1834 and Michael O'Connor to Cullen, June 17, 1842, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; John Dubois to Purcell, September 29, 1835, Cincinnati Papers, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Purcell, December 31, 1836, ibid.; England was only thirty-three when elevated to the hierarchy. He delivered the sermon at a number of his colleagues' consecrations. When Leo DeNeckere was consecrated, Martial reported to Flaget that "Bishop England has done frightful mischief here [in New Orleans]. Every time he preached in the evening there were not more than four or five persons present at the theatre! . . . The audience of the Cathedral, notwithstanding the great numbers and throng, were hushed in so deep a silence that nothing was heard, save a rat." Martial to Flaget, n.d., 1830, ibid.

[45] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, ibid.; Conwell to Maréchal, June 6, 1824, December n.d., 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA; Acts of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 1833, vol. 195, ASN; England to The Reverend Thomas England, January 23, 1829, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; England to Cullen, December 15, 1833, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; England to Maréchal, n.d., 1825, March 4, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; F. Kenrick to Maréchal, n.d., ACHS.

[46] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; Conwell to Maréchal, May 28, 1821, June 6, 1824, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA; Henry Conwell's Document on Presbyterianism, n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; England to Maréchal, December 22, 1822, January 15, 1823, n.d., 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d,

BCA; William Vincent Harrold to Maréchal, April 4, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 22, Documents and Papers, ibid.

[47] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; Henry Conwell's Document on Presbyterianism, n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; Conwell to Maréchal, May 28, 1821, June 6, 1824, December 30, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA; England to Maréchal, January 15, 1823, n.d., 1825, January 7, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, ibid.

[48] Dubois to Bruté, n.d., 1826, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; Dubois to Purcell, October 26, 1832, December 19, 1834, ibid.; Dubois to Purcell, September 29, 1835, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; John Power to Cullen, July 18, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[49] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, ibid.; Conwell to Maréchal, June 6, 1824, December 30, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA; Henry Conwell's Document on Presbyterianism, n.d., and J. McGerry to Cullen, September 15, 1834, and England to Cullen, June 23, 1836, Irish College Correspondence, NDA; England to Maréchal, January 15, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; John Ryan to Maréchal, February 1, 1826, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 20, q-t, ibid.

[50] England to Maréchal, February 12, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, ibid.; Conwell to Maréchal, December 30, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, ibid.; Dubois to Purcell, December 19, 1834, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; Henry Conwell's Document on Presbyterianism, n.d., Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; "An Agreement Between St. Mary's and Henry Conwell to all to Whom these Presents Shall Come," October 9, 1826, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 14c, BCA.

[51] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; England to Maréchal, December 22, 1822, January 15, 1823, January 7, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA.

XUM

[52] Diurnal of Bishop John England, 1820-1823, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; England to Maréchal, March 7, July 6 and 18, August 9, December 22, 1821, January 15, February 15, 1823, and June 25, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; Flaget told Bruté that on the advice of England Flaget had decided to convey his own belief that he was "becoming increasingly convinced that a national council would be useful in the lamentable circumstances." Such a meeting, Flaget continued, "is necessary not only to check the trouble in Philadelphia but also to prove to the world that there is a hierarchy. . . . " Flaget to Bruté, June 1, 1827, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[53] England to Maréchal, October 2, 1820, and Benedict Fenwick to Maréchal, December 4, 1820, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA.

[54] England to Maréchal, August 9, 1821, ibid.; Flaget to Leonard Neale, n.d., 1815, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12A, ibid.; David to Bruté, September 13, 1816, Detroit Collection, NDA; Flaget did not consider Maréchal for bishop and "five times more for Archbishop. He does not have the talent for government." Flaget to Bruté, December 6, 1816, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[55] Dubois to Purcell, October 26, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; England to Edward Fenwick, September 18, 1832, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; England to Cullen, December 15, 1833, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[56] Conwell to Maréchal, March 20, 1824, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; William Vincent to Maréchal, December 4, 1826, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 22, Documents and Papers, ibid.; Francis Rolof to Maréchal, April 3, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 20, q-t, ibid.

[57] In response to Maréchal's request for a list of questions to be discussed at a council, England told the Archbishop that "if I withhold what you ask for it is because I am under the impression that it would be folly to prepare subjects for a meeting which is not likely to be held." England to Maréchal, April 26, 1827, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, ibid; England to The Reverend Thomas England, January 23, 1829, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA.

XUM

[58] Writing to Cullen England said that "at the Council [1829] a very general prejudice existed against me for what I had done in Rome." He expressed the same sentiment in later letters to Cullen. Dubois agreed. And Hughes was "sorry" that England "is made the butt of so many attacks." As late as March 1834, F. Kenrick told Cullen about "the suspicion with which every measure emanating from Bishop England is viewed." England to Cullen, December 15, 17, 1833, May 31, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; England to E. Fenwick, September 18, 1832, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; Dubois to Purcell, September 29, 1835, ibid. and October 26, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; Hughes to Mt. St. Mary's, January 12, 1831, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Cullen, March 30, 1834, ACHS; F. Kenrick to Tobias Kirby, January 6, 1847, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[59] England to Cullen, December 15, 1833, ibid.; Peter Guilday, The Life and Times of John England, 1786-1845 (2 vols.; New York, 1927), II, 261.

XUM

VI. CONCILIAR GOVERNMENT

In 1829 the American bishops reactivated the practice, dormant since 1810, of convening frequently to establish intramural uniformity in matters of church policy.

A number of essentials contributed to the success of conciliar government, as this practice was termed. Inbreeding and constant correspondence among the bishops, reinforced by a group commitment to the primacy of the Archbishop of Baltimore, gave the hierarchy a sense of true community.[1] Increasing similarity of experience also made the bishops more apt to share similar perceptions of situations. They mutually enforced these perceptions as well as their subsequent policy interpretations through a loose structure of regional gatherings. Almost social events, these local meetings proved an excellent format for changing individual prelate's attitudes by encouraging participation in discussions of mutual problems.[2] Of course, the bishops were also trained in individual diocesan decision-making. Some, like Flaget, depended upon frequent legislative assemblies in administering their sees. Others governed more autonomously.[3] Whatever their differences in administrative styles, every bishop had established some sort of grass-roots political structure by 1829. National programs therefore found ready instrumentation at the local level, while individual conflicts among bishops used to diocesan freedom were not detrimental to an overall sense of unity.

Aside from these more or less informal expressions of episcopal community, the groundwork for a formal conciliar government had been laid years before by John Carroll. His pre-episcopal organization of the Select Body of the Clergy to govern American Catholics set the trend for episcopal legislative assemblies. After becoming bishop, it was quite natural for Carroll to convene a formal meeting of his diocesan priests in 1791 and of his new suffragan bishops in 1810; another gathering scheduled for 1812 was, as already noted, postponed for various reasons. These meetings established the infrastructure upon which a viable conciliar government could be built. By 1829 such informal and formal developments had combined to create a compulsion for united action that only required an opportunity to flower. Repeated crises and challenges to episcopal authority, both from above (Rome) and from below (laity and clerics), amply provided such an opportunity.

But while there were many leaders among the bishops after Carroll, galvanizing the hierarchy into united action had to await the appearance of John England. Archbishops Neale and Maréchal both had been unable to wield the same degree of unifying influence that their predecessor had. This was in part due to their personalities.[4] But the growth of the hierarchy and expansion of ecclesiastical units also aggravated the strains on episcopal fealty to any one man's decisions for the entire church. As an outsider, England could and in some ways did bring a fresh and simple perspective to a stale and complex situation, despite the discontent he caused. Trained as an organizer in the Irish emancipation movement and admired if not completely trusted by most American bishops, he did not weld the group together or control it. Revised conciliar government was more a reflection of the hierarchy's compactness than England's zeal. What England did do was to stimulate an already strongly integrated episcopacy to concerted action.

Once animated, these men created a formal structure. In turn, the structure provided a basis for immediate action in critical situations, being effectively directed against Roman political pretensions, as already shown. But the system also served the routine function of efficient American church government. Government through councils was the most effective means of preserving an episcopal polity against Catholic presbyterian inroads. Certainly it was through this system that the bishops simultaneously nationalized the American church and centralized that institution's decision-making authority in a traditional episcopacy.

At the First Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1829 the bishops commenced the legislative liquidation of presbyterianism. The fifth conciliar decree urged that prelates sponsor no church whose deed was not in their own hands; the sixth decree made it clear that there would be no democratic selection or _jus patronatus_ of priests or bishops in the Baltimore Archdiocese, and that donations of the faithful would not establish title to such. The seventh and eighth decrees exhorted all bishops to use canonical penalties, meaning spiritual sanctions, to bring unyielding vestrymen to terms. Propaganda softened the original wording of these two decrees by inserting the clause that canonical sanctions were to be used only "when all other means apparently fail." In the Third Provincial Council (1837), the Fourth (1840), the Fifth (1842), and the Seventh (1849) the fathers supplemented or modified these regulations, but they remained substantially the same throughout.

Finally, the bishops formally declared the extension of anti-presbyterian legislation to the whole American church in the First Plenary Council in 1852.[5]

Now it was up to individual bishops to promulgate and enforce these decrees in their own dioceses. They all did. Naturally, the extent to which each bishop applied every measure differed, due once again to individual administrative styles but also dependent upon the degree of presbyterian diocesan entrenchment. Some bishops followed Francis Kenrick, Conwell's successor, who refused to disturb modes of property ownership in old congregations, declaring it his intention to hold only the deeds of new properties in his own name.[6] Others were amenable to Timon's successful and Hughes's unsuccessful efforts at supporting state legislation that would allow bishops to hold property as corporations sole. These men strictly enforced the conciliar decrees.[7] "When all other means apparently failed," every prelate was willing to use spiritual sanctions to force compliance.[8]

Of course presbyterian episodes continued to occur, but from 1829 on episcopal victory was a palpable one. During the period of revived conciliar governance the really troublesome presbyterian activities were in the Northeast, most spectacularly in New York State, where

Catholic laymen joined with Know Nothings to legislate successfully against episcopal political power. A legal victory to be sure, but one with slight practical effect. Hughes predicted that the bishops would find "twenty ways outside the intricate web" of the laws upholding presbyterianism.[9] At least the prelates found one way. They overrode legal sanctions with religious ones, primarily by refusing to administer the sacraments to obstinate lay trustees.

Actually, after 1860 whatever lay agitation remained was practically limited to maintaining the ethno-cultural identity of an individual congregation. Certainly lay resistance to episcopacy had always been flavored by issues other than a preference for political independence. Presbyterian tendencies were indeed entangled with the desire of various ethnic groups for compatriot priests and bishops. Obviously this was true in the highly visible Irish-directed Northeastern trustee episodes. Similarly, German and French Catholics (so-called Marquilliers) in the East and West simultaneously used American liberties to support lay independence and separate ethnic congregations.[10] Despite this, the primary impetus for and focus of presbyterianism was political, not ethno-cultural. And this viewpoint was clearly indigenous to American Catholicism, having its origin in the Colonial period. Political democracy, not any foreign ideology or practice, inspired what was a distinctive and widespread American Catholic presbyterian phenomenon. This has never been recognized, in part because presbyterianism and ethno-cultural defensiveness were so often intertwined. Even John England initially confused Irish-American demands for compatriot priests with Catholic independent tendencies in Ireland. But they were not the same, as England discovered. In Ireland the bishops directed a quasi-Gallican movement. In the United States laymen actually nurtured presbyterian proclivities, meaning that they tended to be anti-episcopal irrespective of nativity.

By the end of the period under discussion the laity was clearly shifting its emphasis from political presbyterianism toward an almost exclusive concern with ethno-cultural issues. Catholics heightened their agitation for compatriot priests and bishops, who in turn were expected to aid ethnic congregations in maintaining language distinctions and peculiarities in forms of worship. Disturbing doubts about the efficacy of a traditional Roman ecclesiastical system, however, no longer accompanied such demands. In short, unlike presbyterianism, ethno-cultural centrism did not directly challenge an episcopal system; an ethnic congregation could conceivably organize itself around a presbyterian or even a congregational polity. But the one clearly ethno-cultural schismatic group within the American church maintained an episcopal structure when it organized the Polish Catholic National Church in 1907.[11] Of course, this shift toward a preoccupation with ethno-cultural identity clearly reflected the increasing pluralism in Catholic nativity, as revealed in Tables 1 and 2, Chapter II. On the other hand, this lay shift in emphasis and episcopal politicalization emerged simultaneously. Certainly, then, the "new" lay attitude also reflected the bishops' success in establishing a strong traditional episcopacy.

Ethno-cultural centrism did challenge the hierarchy's commitment to an integrative American church. Like presbyterianism, it possessed the potential for creating a plurality of schismatic and independent churches in the United States. Unlike presbyterianism, it threatened the spiritual corporate sense of an American Catholic community more than its political organization. Already well documented is the fact that this community had never been ethnically homogeneous. Naturally, all Catholic ethnic groups in the United States shared a broad European cultural tradition and were equally committed to legitimate religion, especially sacramental orthodoxy. But pluralistic national constituencies were unknown in Europe. Rather, confessional churches organized according to national boundaries were characteristic, nourishing variations in religious practice--for example, where the altar should be placed and the forms used in administering the sacraments. Of course, in America language differences sharply magnified European confessional distinctions.

From 1789 through 1829 American bishops accepted both the concept and the practice of ethno-cultural congregations. Clearly they did not have much choice; their national constituency was pluralistic. As with presbyterianism so with ethno-cultural congregational identity, the hierarchy was willing to accept it if it neither subverted episcopal authority nor led to schismatic or independent churches. Carroll set the precedent for episcopal sanction of this movement when he complied with a request in 1789 from a group of Philadelphia Germans to separate from Irish-dominated St. Mary's congregation. Arguing that they wished to "keep up their respective nation and language," the Germans promised to recognize Carroll's jurisdiction over them, accepting as their priests only those whom the new bishop might choose.[12] Following the incorporation in 1799 of this first clearly ethno-cultural

XUM

congregation--Holy Trinity--the impulse spread rapidly through the nation. Unless such congregations tended toward presbyterianism, as many did before 1829, the prelates freely sanctioned them. Even if entangled with presbyterian episodes, however, most bishops tried to accommodate some degree of ethno-cultural centrism. When the Charleston-Norfolk activities had reached a boiling point, Neale still believed it proper to comply with Irish practices respecting funeral ceremonies. In America priests were not obliged as they were in Ireland "to go to private houses to attend the corpse to the burying ground." Nevertheless, Neale thought they should do so upon request. Besides, "some good might come of it."[13] When presbyterian enthusiasm in the region had temporarily cooled, Maréchal readily consented to pleas from members of an Irish-dominated congregation in Richmond, Virginia, for a compatriot priest. All the bishops agreed that Maréchal had done the right thing.[14] Indeed, they were themselves trying to accommodate emerging ethno-cultural demands in their own dioceses. Discussion of alternatives filled their correspondence. Of particular concern was the recruitment and training of loyal, stable, and well-educated Irish, German, and French priests. The consensus preferred foreign-speaking priests who had been educated or at least experienced in the American mission.[15]

XUM

Despite these efforts at accommodation, the bishops shared Carroll's fear that "ethnic separations may prevent divine service from being performed with the same concourse and general approbation" in all congregations throughout the country.[16] Experience was teaching these leaders many things about the institutionalization of religious power in a democratic republic. One of the important lessons they learned was that something more than political emasculation of Propaganda and the American laity was necessary to develop a corporate sense of Catholic community in the United States. Common traditions seemed imperative. Nourishment for such a system had to be American, not European.

Quite amorphous, however, were the bishops' attempts before 1829 to cultivate common religious beliefs and practices. Carroll favored the use of the vernacular in the liturgy and initially opposed study in Rome for aspirants to the American priesthood.[17] His colleagues joined him in desiring an American-trained clergy and hierarchy. And all the prelates used personal diplomacy to obtain Roman dispensations that made certain religious practices, especially matrimony and baptism, more closely reflect American exigencies. One recurring request was that priests be allowed to perform marriages between Catholics and non-Catholics, providing of course the non-Catholic party was a baptized Christian and promised to raise resulting children in the true faith. Confusion, if not further divisiveness, often followed such measures, since each bishop was acting independently in behalf of his own diocese.[18]

Concerted action through conciliar government was once again the key to success. At the First Provincial Council (1829) the hierarchy began the promulgation of an American Catholic spirituality. This task would be even more difficult than the campaign against presbyterianism. Therefore the bishops cast a wide net. The fathers commissioned Bishop Joseph Rosati to compose a detailed guide to ceremonies and practices to be observed in all American provincial councils and diocesan synods, a set of procedures shortly to appear as the Ceremonial for the Use of the Catholic Churches in the United States of America. And they began the process of legislating on every conceivable issue pertaining to questions of belief and worship, a practice consistently followed in every subsequent council.[19] At the end of each meeting the prelates addressed a collective pastoral letter to the laity, commenting on the current state of Catholicism, summarizing recent conciliar legislation and the reasons for its passage, and exhorting Catholics to keep the faith.[20] This task the bishops took very seriously,

XUM

always selecting the author of the pastoral with great care.[21] Clearly they viewed the letter as an educational device that affirmed both the particular legislation passed and the concept of episcopal government through councils.

The legislation was then carried to the grass roots. Each bishop promulgated and enforced the decrees in his own diocese, usually by bringing his priests together in local diocesan synods.[22] Some bishops even wrote their own pastoral letters to diocesan laymen, reinforcing and at the same time personalizing the collective epistle.[23] Another and perhaps the most effective way in which the bishops disseminated their council-formulated spirituality was through the catechism. The Bardstown Catechism, written by Bishop John David and adopted by his colleagues for use in their dioceses throughout the country, proved to be the most important such device. Catechisms also served another purpose. They popularized the hierarchy's liberal theological positions, primarily those on the limits of Papal authority and the correct relationship between the Roman Catholic Church and the American Republic.

No exaggerated or crass nationalistic fervor underlay this episcopal movement toward an American Catholic spirituality. Neither was it primarily addressed to

XUM

making Catholicism less ritualistic, less Popish, or less mysterious for the benefit of non-Catholics. (As usual, however, the bishops took this dimension seriously.)[24] By carefully insisting upon a uniform spirituality, episcopacy was taking another step toward fulfilling its commitment to build an integrative American church spiritually wedded to Rome.

Naturally ethno-cultural centrism, unlike presbyterianism, could never be legislated out of existence. Congregations organized by nativity continued; they still exist today. Conflict between various foreign-born groups within the church has been one of the most constant, albeit not yet clearly understood, themes in American Catholicism. By 1852, however, ethno-cultural distinctions were well on their way to being legislatively limited to nonspiritual matters like language and social activities (for example, festivals celebrating the birth date of particular national patron saints).

When Rome in 1852 refused to make the Archdiocese of Baltimore a primate see, it added the warning that the American hierarchy should avoid the danger that lay in too rigid a national uniformity. It was too late. The bishops could not now avoid what they had practically accomplished--all those things "that tended by accumulation to give the American Church the semblance of a national organization."[25] Perhaps Rome could do only what it did do--exert a greater measure of control. Contrary to accepted scholarship, it is quite possible that Rome was not totally confused when it addressed its famous condemnation of Americanism in 1899 to the American church.[26] Rome was partially confused, however, by equating American independent tendencies with European Gallicanism. The bishops had insisted time and again that they never harbored a desire to break away from the spiritual center of Catholic unity, Rome. Their deeds, of course, suggest that this desire may have degenerated to mere rhetoric. Had not Rome stepped in when it did, the church in America might even have gone the full Gallican route.

At the very least it can be said that Catholics in the United States were forced by their American leaders to make a strong institutional commitment in order to support a stronger devotional one. Perhaps this was one of the most significant similarities between Catholics and other highly organized Protestant denominations, primarily non-evangelical groups. Conversely, it may have been one of the most important distinctions between all strongly institutionalized religious denominations--Catholic and Protestant--in nineteenth century American and their evangelical or so-called pietistic counterparts.[27]

Notes

[1] Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884* (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 161.

[2] For a discussion of regional meetings before 1829 see Francis Kenrick to Paul Cullen, June 6, 1846, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana.

[3] Decrees of the First Synod of Mobile, Alabama, January 19, 1835, ibid.; Benedict Fenwick discussed how bishops governed their dioceses. B. Fenwick to Anthony Blanc, November 18, 1842, New Orleans Collection, ibid.; Father Thomas Butler to John Purcell, December 7, 8, 9, 1848, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[4] Benedict Flaget to Simon Bruté, December 6, 1816, ibid.; Flaget told Leonard Neale that Cheverus, already Bishop of Boston, would be much better than Maréchal for Coadjutor to Baltimore and therefore successor to Neale. David knew Maréchal was "wrong" if he thought that either David or Flaget had "contributed to his [Maréchal's] nomination as Coadjutor of Baltimore." Flaget and David both believed that Maréchal would make a poor administrator; As for Leonard Neale, John Carroll expressed his colleagues' opinion when he told Charles Plowden that Neale was a "worthy" man, but his principles were "too monastic," sometimes "denying the liberty which all here will lay claim too." Flaget to L. Neale, n.d., 1815, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12A, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland; David to Bruté, September 13, 1816, Detroit Collection, NDA; Carroll to Plowden, March 12, 1802, Department of Archives and MSS, Catholic University of America (CUA), Washington, D.C.

[5] Guilday, *Councils of Baltimore*, 90, 91, 120-142, 154-163, 176; *Concilia Provincialia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849* (Baltimore, 1851), 31-92, 123-229, 263-292.

[6] F. Kenrick to the Philadelphia Laity, n.d., 1829, American Catholic Historical Society Archives (ACHS), St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, Overbrook, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Flaget to Blanc, October 21, 1842, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[7] John Hughes to Samuel Eccleston, November 24, 1845, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

XUM

[8] Ibid.; Michael Portier to Blanc, August 28, 1842, New Orleans Collection, NDA.

[9] *Brooksania; or, The Controversy between Senator Brooks and Archbishop Hughes* (New York, 1855), 54.

[10] Father Stephen Montgomery to Edward Fenwick, September 26, 1829, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; Francis Badin to Purcell, August 27, 1841, ibid.; Blanc to Purcell, March 2, 1850, ibid.; Father Joseph Brogard to Blanc, February 17, 1841, New Orleans Collection, ibid.; B. Fenwick to Blanc, November 18, 1842, ibid.; John Chanche to Blanc, August 11, 1843, ibid.; Flaget to The Trustees of St. Anne's Parish of the Cote Du Nord Est, Detroit, Michigan, November 15, 1816, February 23, July 1 and 8, 1817, Detroit Collection, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Cullen, December 29, 1842, November 23, 1843, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[11] John Tracy Ellis, *American Catholicism* (Chicago, 2nd rev., 1969), 129, 130.

[12] N. A. Weber, "The Rise of the National Catholic Churches in the United States," *Catholic Historical Review*, I (January 1816), 422-434; "Minutes of the Trustees of the German Religious Society of Roman Catholics called the Church of the Holy Trinity in the City of Philadelphia," printed in *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXI, 23-27; Bruté to Frederick Résé, January 8, 1835, Detroit Collection, NDA.

[13] L. Neale to James Lucas, March 26, 1817, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[14] Weber, "The Rise of the National Catholic Churches in the United States," 422.

[15] John England to Ambrose Maréchal, December 22, 1822, n.d., 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15c,d, BCA; F. Kenrick to Purcell, October 1, 1833, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky; Portier to Blanc, January 23, 1844, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Blanc, March 9, 1837, NDA; Eccleston to Purcell and F. Kenrick to Purcell, February 9, 1837, ibid.; Flaget to Bruté, December 6, 1816, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; England to E. Fenwick, September 18, 1832, ibid.; John Dubois to Purcell, September 29, 1835,

XUM

ibid.; Bruté to Résé, January 8, 1835, Detroit Collection, ibid.; Chanche to Blanc, n.d., New Orleans Collection, ibid.; Father Hercule Brassac to Blanc, December 11, 1840, ibid.; Bruté to Blanc, November 25, 1838, January 8, 1839, ibid.; Flaget to Propaganda, January 4, 1822, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Tobias Kirby, January 6, 1847, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[16] Quoted in Weber, "The Rise of the National Catholic Churches in the United States," 422.

[17] Carroll to Joseph Berington, n.d., 1787, BCA; Carroll to Cardinal Antonelli, July 23, 1785, ibid.

[18] Annabelle Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore, 1735-1815 (New York, 1955), 240, 241; Maréchal's "Rules for Interfaith Marriage," September 30, 1817, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 21, v-z, BCA; Maréchal to Jesuits at Georgetown, June 19, 1823, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Supplement to Box 21A, ibid.; Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; E. Fenwick, Pastoral Letter, 1827, NDA; Propaganda to E. Fenwick, December 17, 1823, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; Father Charles Montgomery to Purcell, November 23, 1833, ibid.; Eccleston to Purcell, January 28, 1835, ibid.; Propaganda to E. Fenwick, December 16, 1826, June 24, 1827, May 11, 1828, Detroit Collection, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Cullen, November 23, 1843, January 12, 26, June 6, 1846, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Kirby, March 23, 1846, January 4, 1847, ibid.; John Henni to Peter Lefevere, n.d., 1844, Detroit Collection, ibid.

[19] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 81-186; Dubois to Purcell, December 19, 1834, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[20] National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919, ed. Peter Guilday (Washington, 1923), 17-196.

[21] England told Cullen that he was busy "writing the lay pastoral letter . . . . committed to me by the last council [1833]." Hughes, who was asked to write the 1840 Council's pastoral, said: "I think that now poor Bishop England is gone, it would be wise for you [Eccleston] to distribute this part of the public office among the others so as to make it light for each." England to Cullen, April 29, 1837, Irish College Correspondence,

1828-69, NDA; Hughes to Eccleston, December 5, 1842, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[22] F. Kenrick to the Philadelphia Laity, n.d., 1829, ACHS; Decrees of the First Synod of Mobile, Alabama, January 19, 1835, NDA; Father Thomas Butler to Purcell, December 7, 8, 9, 1848, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; O'Connor followed the practice of most American bishops of using diocesan synods to promulgate the conciliar decrees. He believed the method produced a "good spirit that prevades the whole body of the clergy and people, emanating from the hierarchy and spreading through the whole mass." O'Connor to Cullen, June 17, 1842, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[23] For example: E. Fenwick's Pastoral, 1827, ibid.; Hughes's Pastoral, 1838, ibid.; and F. Kenrick's Pastoral as Coadjutor to Philadelphia, April 22, 1831, ACHS.

[24] David to Bruté, January 9, 1818, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; F. Kenrick to Propaganda, December 11, 1823, ibid.; Bruté to William Gaston, May 28, 1830, Charleston, South Carolina Papers, NDA; Richard Miles to Purcell, February 6, 1838, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; B. Fenwick to E. Fenwick, July 19, 1830, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Cullen, March 28, 1843, June 27, December 14, 1844, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Kirby, August 21, November 15, 1845, ibid.; Flaget to Blanc, January 11, 1840, New Orleans Collection, ibid.; Chanche to Blanc, August 22, 1842, ibid.; Richard Martial to Propaganda, August 28, 1829, 166r to 167r, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[25] Quoted in Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 181.

[26] Thomas McAvoy, The Great Crisis In American Catholic History, 1895-1900 (Chicago, 1957), laid the basis for the "confusion" hypothesis.

[27] Recent studies suggest a relationship between denominational organization and the formation of mass political parties in the Jacksonian period. Ronald Formisano, The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861 (Princeton, 1971).

VII. EPISCOPACY AND THE ORDERS

The bishops faced an intramural challenge from another source--the religious orders or so-called regular clergy. Episcopal victory in this conflict was less palpable. Compared to episcopal-regular relations in Europe, it is probably true that the American hierarchy achieved incredible success. But it never controlled the regulars to the same extent that it did the laity. Nor did the hierarchy have a power over regular clerics equivalent to that it had over their non-regular or so-called secular counterparts. By personally directing diocesan seminaries, refusing to institute a parish system with tenured pastors, and crushing presbyterianism, the bishops established an arbitrary control over secular priests.

The complexity of episcopal-regular contention impeded a clear-cut victory for either group. The conflict itself antedated the official creation of the American hierarchy. Its origin lay in the development of religious societies in Europe. Over the years, orders like the Jesuits and Sulpicians had built reputations as strongly organized and largely autonomous pressure groups within the Roman Church. In America, the story had its own peculiar flavor. Initially, it echoed the contention between secular and regular clergy that had disturbed the harmony of missionary life in England for years. Such conflict between the secular clergy and the Jesuits and other regulars in England from the time of Elizabeth I inevitably influenced the Maryland Jesuits in the direction of autonomy from episcopal control. Nourished by colonial conditions, the Jesuits' anti-episcopal leanings came to be shared by most American Catholics.

As time went on, the Jesuits also began to have problems with Propaganda. These were not limited to America. There were difficulties over the Chinese rites and in England and Scotland and elsewhere. Such controversies combined with the American developments previously discussed helped the Jesuits in Maryland and Pennsylvania to develop attitudes hostile to Propaganda. The suppression of the order by Pope Clement XIV in 1773 naturally sharpened these attitudes. Suppression meant, among other things, that Jesuit property was supposed to be turned over to non-regular church authorities.[1] Because of the uncertain juridic status of colonial Catholics, Propaganda could conceivably confiscate the ex-Jesuit estates in America. Of course, the order had much to lose, having acquired considerable temporalities since its early (1634) establishment in Maryland. Even the most stalwart anti-episcopacy faction among the ex-Jesuits was therefore motivated to reconsider its position. Led by Leonard Neale, this faction reluctantly came to accept the argument put forth by ex-Jesuit Carroll and supported by a faction of like-minded confreres: Only a regular American episcopacy could assure a nonpolitical relationship with Rome, thereby insuring ex-Jesuit estates against seizure by Propaganda. Indeed the ex-Jesuits' distrust of Propaganda's intentions had outweighed their disdain of an American episcopacy.[2] On the other hand, they worried that even a national hierarchy might decide to confiscate the order's property. But at least this arrangement held out the possibility of episcopal-regular accommodation on the question of property ownership and control.[3]

When Carroll became bishop he was therefore confronted with a group of ex-Jesuits who owned a considerable amount of church property and meant to retain it. In 1782, after the order's suppression, Carroll had organized the Select Body of the Clergy. The principal aim of this group was to thwart Roman political pretensions with respect to American Catholicism. Another was to protect ex-Jesuit property from Roman seizure. Forming a legal corporation, the Select

XUM

Body elected from among its members trustees to administer ex-Jesuit property in the "general interests of religion," until such time as the order was restored.[4] In 1805 some American ex-Jesuits decided to affiliate with their Russian counterparts in order to regain their status. The Russian hierarchy had never suppressed the order in that country, taking advantage of Rome's decision to leave enforcement of the suppression decree up to individual national hierarchies. Then, in 1801, Rome granted full canonical existence to the Society in Russia, with the privilege of aggregating members from any part of the world. The ex-Jesuit faction that directed the American affiliation interpreted Rome's canonical restoration of the Russian remnant to apply equally to all affiliates.[5]

This was a debatable viewpoint at best, reflected in the American order's internal dissension. And if Carroll accepted this interpretation the consequences were obvious. The ex-Jesuit affiliates would be entitled to all the rights and privileges they had enjoyed before suppression, including repossession of all former Jesuit property. Under the control of Select Body trustees, themselves ex-Jesuits who opposed the Russian affiliation, the property had become an important part of the general Catholic economy. And

XUM

financial independence was absolutely necessary to the political autonomy the new bishop so desired for his church. Carroll chose the state of the Catholic economy over personal loyalties to his religious order. Through Russian affiliation, Carroll insisted, the American ex-Jesuits had acquired only a quasi-restoration status. The affiliates were "precisely in the state of secular priests, and could not claim any privileges or exemptions to which religious bodies . . . were entitled," because they had not been granted by Rome a full canonical status in the Church.[6] For all practical purposes Russian affiliation had changed nothing. The affiliates continued to be wards of the Select Body trustees, who in turn continued to support the economy of the Baltimore Diocese.

Affiliate agitation to repossess Jesuit property surfaced again in 1812. Actually the issue was reopened quite accidentally. During the War of 1812 fears of British attacks led the affiliates to move their Jesuit novitiate to a succession of locations. By March 1813, their Superior, John Grassi, decided to transfer the novices from St. Inigoes to the Whitemarsh Plantation in Maryland. The trustee responsible for Whitemarsh, Germain Bitouzy, refused to allow the transfer. Grassi responded by insisting upon the affiliate's right to

XUM

repossess all former Jesuit property under the control of the Select Body Corporation. Carroll was surprised and hurt; he had recommended Grassi as superior because he thought the man would not make such demands.[7] Carroll reiterated his earlier position, telling Grassi to "recommend to the members of the Society to . . . convince themselves that they have not, and cannot have yet, any corporate right in the ecclesiastical property of this country." This time he laced his message with a threat: If affiliate demands continued, Carroll would have to withdraw his protection from them, since such support had already strained the patience of other bishops.[8]

Two years later, in 1814, when Rome granted full canonical status to all former Jesuits, the hierarchy in the United States seemed to have no choice but to restore the American order's property.[9] One of the first archiepiscopal acts of Leonard Neale was to do just that. He restored to the jurisdiction of the order its former missions and congregations within the Archdiocese of Baltimore. His belief that this settlement brought to a "proper conclusion" the entire Jesuit "affair" was certainly premature.[10] Many of his cohorts in the hierarchy did not share Neale's Jesuit sympathies. He himself felt such loyalty to his old order that he reaffiliated with it, actually governing as archbishop from the Jesuit-directed Georgetown College.[11]

After Neale's death it was the hierarchy's turn to reopen the Jesuit property issue. When Archbishop Maréchal made his famous trip to Rome in behalf of episcopacy over presbyterianism, he carried another request. Rome should secularize (that is, de-regularize) certain Jesuit estates, notably Deer Creek and Whitemarsh, in part because colonial laymen--according to Maréchal--had donated these plantations to support the entire American mission, not just the Society of Jesus. Furthermore, Maréchal claimed a canonical (that is, legal) episcopal right to these estates. The Roman bull that erected the See of Baltimore in 1789, Maréchal argued, had vested in the bishop of that diocese all property that had previously been held by the Jesuit Fathers in Maryland. In short, he was asking Rome to turn these estates over to the hierarchy, so it could administer the revenues in behalf of the American Catholic economy.[12] In 1822 Rome awarded Whitemarsh to Maréchal and all other pre-suppression property in Maryland to the newly restored Society of Jesus.[13] Rome failed to bolster American episcopal hegemony in relation to the regulars as it had respecting the laity and secular clergy. Even so, the Jesuits refused to accept these conditions.[14] Speaking for episcopacy, Maréchal countered by asking Rome to expel all unyielding Maryland Jesuits from the Society.[15]

Clearly in this last round with the Jesuits the episcopacy was to suffer two blows: one to its purse, the other to its morale. Refusing to give either faction a clear victory, Rome--avoiding the term "expel"--decided to transfer the American Jesuit Superior to Rome. Not only did that officer refuse to go, but he laid the entire matter before the President of the United States.[16] While schismatic laymen might be expected to do something like this, regular clerics certainly were not. President James Monroe, of course, refused to interfere. But publicity embraced the affair. The episode became identified with the highly emotional charge of Popish political pretensions in the United States and with the anti-episcopal activities of Catholic presbyterian factions. In 1826 the Pope quietly urged Maréchal to accept a Jesuit proposal to pay the Archbishop eight hundred Roman Crowns annually until his death. Reluctantly, Maréchal more or less agreed.[17]

Meanwhile, religious orders in the West were causing similar property problems there. The Order of St. Dominic provided the earliest and most important example. In 1804 Edward Fenwick wrote his boyhood friend Carroll from England, telling him that he wanted to return to his native Maryland in order to establish an independent province of the Dominican Order there. Fenwick's dream actually was to erect a college in Maryland.[18] There were already two orders--ex-Jesuits and Sulpicians--in the East, each with its own school. A considerable amount of friction existed between the two and between them and the hierarchy.[19] Certainly a third order was unnecessary and would probably add to the contention. But Carroll could not really turn down the offer: Religious societies were needed to support clerical education, among other things.[20] Since the West was not yet the seat of such a group, Carroll offered the Bardstown mission to the Dominicans. Fenwick accepted.[21] On his preliminary inspection visit to Kentucky, Fenwick found himself greeted by Vicar-General Badin with open arms. Badin sent his "heartfelt" thanks to Carroll for making Kentucky "so effectually the first object of his pastoral solicitude" by sending the Family of St. Dominic there.[22] In the autumn of 1805 Dominican Fathers Thomas Wilson and William Tuite laid the groundwork for Fenwick's permanent arrival in 1806. They purchased a house and five hundred acres of land near Springfield, Kentucky, for the Motherhouse of the order--St. Rose Priory.[23]

It was not long, however, before the Dominicans and Badin began arguing over property ownership. Badin complained to Carroll that "the fathers of St. Dominic want to regularize the secular property of the Church" in the Diocese of Bardstown. He referred in particular to some church property in Scott City that he had given the Dominicans as a "present," and of which Fenwick subsequently claimed ownership.[24] When Badin objected, the Dominicans more or less ignored him. Evidently they had intimated that "neither [Badin] nor the bishop [Flaget] have any control at all over Mr. Fenwick and his brethren." Badin believed that, as in his struggle with Flaget, he was again being made a "party" where he "ought to be a judge." He assured Carroll, however, that he was successfully thwarting Fenwick's "ardent thirst for aggrandizement" by keeping him from "accumulating the church property in Scott City for his Order."[25]

Such success was dangerous. The Dominicans countered, according to Badin, by purposely sowing seeds of dissatisfaction among the laity and clergy toward ecclesiastical discipline and authority. Badin believed that the Dominicans, in common with all regular clerics, suffered from a "spirit of independence and covetousness, love of ease and aversion to missionary hardships. . . . "[26] Carroll disagreed. Concerned for the government of the church in the wake of the development of religious communities in America, Carroll offered criticisms that remained free of such partisan rancor. It was indeed natural for regulars, "feeling that the splendor of the Order is the greatest benefit of religion (as is the case in all religious communities) to convert the fruits of their industry to that business rather than to the general cause of the Church and propagation of the faith," as Carroll knew from his own experience. Carroll thought the Dominicans, like the Jesuits, would probably insist that their income "be absorbed for the advantage of the principle house of the Order."[27]

The danger began to materialize when the Diocese of Cincinnati was created in 1821 out of the huge Bardstown See.[28] The hierarchy nominated Edward Fenwick to be Cincinnati's first bishop. Fenwick seemed a near-perfect addition to church government. A third-generation Marylander, he was well-educated, multilingual, and experienced in the American mission. But he was too deeply involved with the Dominicans. The hierarchy therefore conditioned the nomination on Fenwick's resignation as Dominican Superior.[29] In turn, Fenwick conditioned his acceptance of the nomination on Flaget's agreement to divide Dominican goods and services between their two sees. Specifically, Fenwick agreed to turn over to Flaget titles to Dominican claimed land in Kentucky in return for Flaget's transfer to Cincinnati of land he owned in Ohio and the services of several Kentucky-based Dominicans, especially Fathers Augustine Hill and Thomas Wilson.[30]

The first impediment to Fenwick's membership in the hierarchy was removed when he resigned as Dominican Superior, the second when Flaget assented to Fenwick's proposition.[31] But once Fenwick was consecrated, Flaget delayed the transfers as long as he possibly could, pleading that infirmity and old age kept him from acting. Using a familiar tactic, Fenwick forced the issue. In 1823 he personally visited Rome and threatened to resign from the hierarchy if he did not obtain sufficient material and clerical aid. In short, he was asking Rome to enforce the arrangement to which the two bishops had earlier agreed. Eventually Rome gave Fenwick permission to divide the Dominicans into two American provinces, which Fenwick did.[32]

At this juncture, Francis Kenrick (not yet a bishop but still a theologian at Bardstown Seminary) issued a theological brief on the correct episcopal-regular relationship, formalizing the rationale most bishops were moving toward. Specifically, Kenrick's argument on behalf of Bishop Flaget took the form of a very long letter to Father Frederick Résé, Fenwick's personal secretary and future Bishop of Detroit. Aware of each bishop's protection of his diocesan freedom, Kenrick began by assuring Résé--who of course would submit the message to Fenwick and Ohio Dominican Superior Augustine Hill--that he certainly would not have interfered in the affairs of another diocese if authorities in that see had not "demanded" his opinion and if he were unsupported by the "Venerable authority of the Canons."[33]

Kenrick then applied general Church principles to the special question of ownership and control of properties that had been willed or otherwise given to Fenwick, before and after his elevation, in Canton, Somerset, and Zanesville, Ohio. Giving separate opinions, each dictated by the peculiar circumstances involved, on whether the bishop or Dominican Superior should control specific properties in Ohio, in each Kenrick supported the same general principle: the independence necessary for a bishop to govern the church in the "ways of salvation." If the superior or provincial of any religious Order had "within its grasp" all or almost all of

XUM

the landed property belonging to the church in his diocese and died without leaving a capable successor to perform the necessary congregational duties, the order and the church would "fall at the same time." The letter ended with a personal warning to Fenwick. If he did not want to be shunned by his colleagues or--worse--be reduced to nominal status, Fenwick's zeal for the "true interest" of the "Holy Religion" had best transcend his "solicitude" for the religious order to which he belonged.[34] Despite Kenrick's warnings, canonical and personal, Fenwick chose to share Ohio temporalities with the Dominicans. In common with a few other bishops such as Neale, Fenwick supported the regulars over episcopacy, at least in regard to the property question.[35]

Naturally, this conflict of episcopal interest further hindered the hierarchy from achieving decisive victory in its property quarrels with the orders. More than two-fifths (or 45.1 per cent) of the nationally selected prelates had been regular clerics (see Table 8, Chapter II). This reflected the hierarchy's conscious choice as well as historical accident. On the one hand, the Jesuits had early established a dominant influence in lay affairs, the Sulpicians in clerical education. On the other hand, regulars were also the best source for bishop-making. Secular clerics emigrating to the new Republic were often at best poorly educated; at their worst they might be frauds, libertines, or troublemakers. In contrast, the regulars were highly educated, disciplined, dedicated men, who, regardless of motive, had made a collective commitment to serve in the American mission.[36]

Ironically, regular domination of the hierarchy's membership was itself a source of friction between the body of bishops and the religious societies. Indeed, sometimes such domination resulted in action favorable to the orders and often prevented the hierarchy from taking the same kind of firm, concerted stand against certain independent tendencies of the regulars that it did against other factions within the church. But another factor was that in the midst of a tight vocational market, any drain on the orders' human resources threatened to deplete their ranks severely, maybe even put them out of business.

John England, often accusing both the Sulpicians and Jesuits of conspiring to dominate episcopal ranks, knew that American and European leaders of these societies more often than not opposed the episcopal elevation of their members.[37] John Purcell, whose elevation England sponsored, was convinced that the Roman General of the Jesuits would "not suffer any of his to be episcopised," and the "Lazarists [or Vincentians] of Paris were all out of patience" with American episcopal machinations to initiate one of their leaders, John Timon.[38] John David, who eventually quit the Sulpicians, demanded to know why the Jesuits were hardly "touched" and the "Lazarists" could not give their two Johns--Timon and Odin--to the hierarchy. After all, the Sulpicians had already sacrificed, besides himself, Dubourg, Maréchal, Bruté, Chabrat, and Dubois. The poor Sulpicians, they had become a bishop-making factory.[39] French leaders of that order registered the same concern when they seriously considered repatriating their American contingent. Apparently they were even more convinced than David that the teaching spirit of the order would be lost in America if more of the men were assigned to missionary work or elevated to the hierarchy.[40] Furthermore, regulars could not depend upon the continued loyalty and support of their confreres once they became bishops. Undoubtedly, prelates such as Leonard Neale and Edward Fenwick did indeed grant favors to their orders. But any such bishop might very well adopt the Carroll style of nominal affiliation or, after the fashion of Flaget and David, actually resign from his former community. It is quite likely that the religious communities never gained benefits commensurate with their losses in membership.

This conflict in episcopal interest nourished in the hierarchy a preference for tactics to deal with the regular property issue contrary to those it adopted to control the laity and secular clergy. Even after 1829 the bishops continued to depend upon individual diocesan diplomacy rather than collective council action to solve their property problems with the regulars. For example, Fenwick's successor--John Purcell--spent a quarter of a century disentangling episcopal-regular property ownership in Ohio. In 1861 Purcell sought and was awarded legal title to all church lands in Ohio by the Supreme Court of that state.[41]

Nevertheless, even when the bishops acted through individual diplomacy, or disagreed entirely, they were usually joined together by a common perception of the saliency of the issues that divided them. The hierarchy of course realized that the religious societies wanted to be more or less autonomous. When this tendency involved property issues most bishops, as already seen, believed they could effectively deal with it through individual measures, primarily because this question did not in itself directly challenge an episcopal polity. When these independent inclinations took the form of controlling appointments and dismissals of regular clerics to Catholic congregations, then the bishops believed they had to act in concert. Unless the hierarchy possessed a firm control over congregational priests it could not hope to thwart the movement that threatened its very existence--presbyterianism.

The bishops therefore turned to conciliar government as the most effective way to assure their control over the tenure of all American clerics, regardless of canonical status. Meeting in 1810, the prelates legislated to themselves the exclusive right of assigning and dismissing clergy for pastoral duties. This was meant to apply to regular as well as to secular priests. Regardless of canonical status, once a priest was entrusted with a congregation, he could only be recalled by the diocesan bishop.[42] All the orders periodically ignored or defied this regulation.[43] For example, when Charles Neale (Leonard Neale's brother) was the superior of the quasi-restored ex-Jesuits he defied the regulation on at least two occasions. First he removed an ex-Jesuit from a Philadelphia congregation without even notifying the Bishop, Michael Egan. Then he refused Egan's request for a German Jesuit to minister to a German-speaking congregation in the same city.[44] Carroll wrote Neale a stinging rebuke.[45] Words alone, however, rarely

XUM

stopped Neale and like-minded superiors from the other religious societies. But then, the actions of the superiors never permanently thwarted the hierarchy either. In this particular case Carroll successfully appealed to the Russian Jesuit General, Thaddeus Brzozowski, to replace Neale with John Grassi.[46]

Meanwhile, the bishops continued their collective legislative attack. They unanimously passed three more decrees at the Council of 1829 emphasizing their jurisdiction over the tenure of all priests working in their respective dioceses, and they legislated against the removal of members of the religious orders in pastoral capacities without episcopal consent. Significantly, these were the first three of the thirty-eight decrees passed at this council.[47] As late as 1836, Bishop Résé believed that the relations between seculars and regulars continued to be one of the most important "difficulties" in the American church.[48] Evidently his colleagues agreed, modifying and supplementing the 1829 decrees at subsequent councils. In 1846 the hierarchy actually went so far as to decree to its body the ultimate power to decide whether a secular priest could leave his diocesan position to join a religious order.[49] Propaganda hesitated to grant this "request," since the orders claimed that the episcopal desire to "take over the property of

XUM

the communities" underlay the decree. Admitting that they were anxious to gain as much control as they could over clerical activities, the bishops insisted that they were not asking for the right to be "masters" over the religious orders.[50] Regardless of motivation, the hierarchy employed conciliar government to minimize if not eliminate any regular autonomous tendencies that were not directly and clearly related to property ownership.

Perhaps the increasing stringency of the legislation on the right relationship of episcopacy and regulars reflected in part the relative decline in the number of regular-bishops as the nineteenth century progressed. Of course, the orders' opposition to bishop-making from within their ranks contributed to this trend.[51] But the increase in the number of American-trained and -experienced secular clerics was even more important. Many of these men had received at least some of their education in bishop-directed diocesan schools.

This was yet another source of friction between the orders and the bishops. Not only were religious societies sacrificing some of their best men to the hierarchy but upon receiving the mitre these men usually went into the education business for themselves. John Chanche unraveled the aggravating and expensive process he was willing to undergo to establish a college in his Natchez, Mississippi, diocese, including protracted civil litigation.[52] An inept financial administrator in the throes of presbyterian episodes, John Dubois's educational plans proved exceedingly ambitious.[53] His successor, John Hughes, managed to turn Dubois's fancies into Fordham College.[54] Francis Kenrick refused to let financial problems keep him from enlarging St. Charles Borromeo Seminary, which his predecessor, Bishop Conwell, had founded.[55] Nor did similar concerns prevent Bishop Benedict Fenwick (Edward Fenwick's brother) from developing Holy Cross College.[56] Some of the bishops, of course, farmed out their diocesan institutions to various religious orders, some personally established and supervised them, and some combined the two approaches. Each prelate, however, insisted upon retaining the final decision-making for those educational institutions he initiated, regardless of how they were organized.[57] Such a system naturally eroded the monopolistic control the religious societies had previously established over the intellectual life of the American church.

Bardstown Seminary and College was a paradigm of the prelate-directed educational institution. At one time or another Bardstown numbered among its faculty John David, Francis Kenrick, and alumnus Martin Spalding. Combined with its reputation for good teachers, the

XUM

school also enticed students with its congenial atmosphere--a contrast to the rigid Sulpician piety and strictly disciplined environment of the oldest American seminary, St. Mary's of Baltimore. Indeed, Bardstown became one of the most successful training institutions of American priests and bishops in the first half of the nineteenth century.[58] For this, founders and directors Flaget and David paid a high price: the enmity of the eastern Sulpician establishment. The superiors of St. Mary's Seminary waged a vigorous campaign against Bardstown. First they tried to have David removed from the faculty by petitioning European Sulpician authorities to transfer him from Bardstown to St. Mary's.[59] Following the death of Philadelphia's first bishop, Egan, the St. Mary's faction was willing to promote David as successor, providing he could divide his time between that see and St. Mary's.[60] Flaget managed to block both attempts by asking and receiving permission from Rome to make David Coadjutor Bishop of Bardstown.[61] Retaliating, the eastern Sulpicians appealed to European authorities to deny Bardstown Seminary and College official recognition as a Sulpician institution.[62] Flaget and David responded by resigning from the Society of St. Sulpice.[63] These activities vividly reflected the depth and divisiveness of episcopal-regular competition for preeminence in the intellectual life of American Catholicism.

Yet this conflict did not sacrifice, as is commonly assumed, Catholic educational progress.[64] Quite the contrary. What did occur was a shift from an eastern and regular monopoly to a more geographically diffused episcopal-regular sharing of higher education. In turn, the secular institutions produced future prelates such as Spalding and Timon, both liberal theologians and able administrators. And, like everything else they did, the bishops refused to govern their schools according to the rigidity of Old World patterns. They abandoned the fixed principles of European monastic education in favor of a more flexible system.[65] Most of them shared Dubois's dream of a national seminary in which priests would imbibe American culture.[66] During this period the hierarchy never did establish such a school; but they laid the basis for the Catholic University of America, which opened at Washington in November 1889.

Individual bishops nurtured their colleges and seminaries "not by rules irrevocably, but by a slow experience which would point out the advantages or disadvantages of such and such rules."[67] One measure of their success was the collective spirit of the men who graduated from these schools. Those alumni who themselves became prelates proved strongly committed to a church that was socially and politically American while spiritually Roman.

Notes

[1] Malcomn Hay, Failure in the Far East (Philadelphia, 1957), gives a pro-Jesuit account of many of these problems. His view should be balanced by articles such as Vincent A. McClelland, "Scots, Jesuits, and Episcopal Authority, 1603-1773," Dublin Review, DVIII (Summer 1966), 111-132.

[2] Thomas Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal (2 vols.; London, 1917), I, passim, II, 602, 603.

[3] Leonard Neale to John Carroll, January 11, 1785, Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA), Baltimore, Maryland.

[4] Carroll to Charles Plowden, May 8, July 12, 1789, Department of Archives and MSS, Catholic University of America (CUA), Washington, D.C.

[5] Carroll to Robert Molyneux, June 21, 1805, ibid.

[6] Carroll to Charles Neale, November 5, 1811, ibid.

[7] M. Brislen, "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale," Historical Records and Studies, XXXIV (1954), 2-112.

[8] Carroll to John Grassi, April 30, 1813, CUA.

[9] The Papal Bull restoring the Society was Sollicitude Omnium Ecclesiarum.

[10] Arrangement made by L. Neale with the Jesuits, "Regulating the Missions of the Said Society within Baltimore Diocese," April 13, 1816, Archbishop Neale Papers, Box 12A, BCA.

[11] Brislen, "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale," 2-112.

[12] Ambrose Maréchal to Propaganda, n.d., 1821, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15 c,d, BCA.

[13] The Brief, Quum Nobis Relatum, was issued on July 23, 1822, ibid.

[14] Maryland Jesuits to Roman General of Jesuits, November 22, 1822, ibid.

XUM

[15] Maréchal to Propaganda, December 27, 1822, ibid.

[16] Propaganda to Maréchal, May 25, 1823, ibid.

[17] Propaganda to Maréchal, August 5, 1826, ibid.

[18] Victor O'Daniel, *The Right Rev. Edward Dominic Fenwick, O.P.* (Washington, 1937), 83, 87; Stephen Badin to Edward Fenwick, October 5, 1825, Cincinnati Collection, University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA), Notre Dame, Indiana.

[19] A certain amount of antagonism existed between the Jesuits of Georgetown College and the Sulpicians of St. Mary's Seminary. An anti-Gallican spirit among some of the older Jesuits, but more important the clashing educational aspirations of the administrations and faculties of the two schools was the cause of the contention. Theoretically, Georgetown was founded for the classical training of young men, while St. Mary's was intended for the purpose of educating the secular clergy. In July 1800, the Select Body of the Clergy resolved to introduce philosophy at Georgetown, thereby jeopardizing St. Mary's monopoly of clerical education. The Jesuits were even more opposed to the Sulpician established Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Maryland, considering the academy prejudicial to the growth of Georgetown. Carroll did not like the idea either, but was forced to compromise--allowing the Mount to exist but restricting its enrollment to twelve, then twenty-four, students--when the European Superior of the Sulpicians, James Andrew Emery, threatened to recall his Order to France. Following some intra-Sulpician haggling between the Mount and St. Mary's, the Society considered suppressing the college and transferring the students to Georgetown. John Dubois discussed the pros and cons of uniting the Mount and St. Mary's in a letter to John Purcell, October 26, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN), Nazareth, Kentucky. It was finally decided to maintain the college but broaden its appeal by admitting non-Catholic students. For the early history of these institutions see Joseph William Ruane, *The Beginnings of the Society of St. Sulpice in the United States, 1791-1829* (Washington, D.C., 1935), and John M. Daley, *Georgetown Unitersity: Origin and Early Years* (Washington, D.C., 1957).

XUM

[20] Benedict Flaget's Report to Pius VII on the Condition of the Diocese of Bardstown, April 10, 1815, ASN.

[21] O'Daniel, Edward Fenwick, 83, 87.

[22] Badin to Carroll, May 15, 1805, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[23] O'Daniel, Edward Fenwick, 83, 87.

[24] Badin to Carroll, February 9, 1807, March 10, 1808, Archbishop Carroll Papers, Box 12, Letters and Papers, BCA.

[25] Badin to Carroll, March 10, 1808, ibid.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Carroll to Badin, n.d., 1808, ibid.

[28] Pius VII's Bull creating the Diocese of Cincinnati, June 19, 1821, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[29] Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., 1821, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[30] Flaget to E. Fenwick, May 15, 1825, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[31] Ibid.

[32] E. Fenwick to Badin, August 23, 1823, ibid.; E. Fenwick to Propaganda, April 16, 1823, ibid.

[33] Francis Kenrick to Frederick Résé, December 16, 1825, Detroit Collection, ibid.

[34] Ibid.

[35] William Dubourg to E. Fenwick, January 10, 1826, ibid.

[36] The persecution of the Church by the French Revolutionary forces after 1790 played a decisive role in the emigration of European priests, especially the Sulpicians.

[37] John England to Paul Cullen, September 26, December 15, 1833, May 13, 1834, and England to Michael O'Connor, February 25, 1835, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA.

[38] Purcell to Anthony Blanc, February 12, 1839, New Orleans Collection, ibid.

[39] Purcell to Blanc, September 5, 1839, ibid.; John David to Blanc, June 10, 1838, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Purcell, December 13, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[40] David to Blanc, June 10, 1838, New Orleans Collection, NDA. The sole object of the Society of St. Sulpice was the training of priests, which European authorities had consented to depart from for awhile because of the scarcity of missionaries in America.

[41] Acts of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 1833, ASN; Pope Gregory to Purcell, March 8, 1833, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; Nicholas Young to Purcell, March 11, 28, 1834, May 24, 1836, and April 10, 1838, ibid. As late as 1841, Dominican Charles Montgomery, who in 1823 had welcomed Purcell's appointment to a diocese that had been without a prelate for one year, complained to Purcell that he had violated the agreement he had made with the order allowing it to receive "lots" in its own name in return for payment of a yearly stipend to Purcell. Purcell complained, too. He believed the Dominicans had caused "deep wounds" in the West. Montgomery to Purcell, September 8, 1841 and November 23, 1823, ibid.; Purcell to England, October 9, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.; Purcell to American College, Rome, August 1, 1861, ibid.

[42] Minutes of the Meeting of 1810, Baltimore, November 19, 1810, ibid.

[43] Nicholas Young to Purcell, May 24, 1837, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; John Chanche to Blanc, September 17, 1845, New Orleans Collection, ibid.

[44] Michael Egan to Carroll, October 14, 1811, August 9, 1812, BCA.

[45] Brislen, "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale," 2-112.

[46] Carroll to Grassi, April 30, 1813, CUA.

[47] Peter Guilday, A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884 (2nd ed.; New York, 1969), 90, 91; Concilia Provincialia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849 (Baltimore, 1851), 31-92.

[48] Résé to Purcell, October 10, 1836, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[49] Guilday, Councils of Baltimore, 100-163; Concilia Provincilia, 233-259.

[50] Résé to Purcell, October 10, 1836, Cincinnati Collection, NDA.

[51] England to Cullen, September 26, December 15, 1833, May 13, 1834 and to O'Connor, February 25, 1835, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[52] Chanche to Blanc, July 12, August 22, 1842 and June 6, 1844, New Orleans Collection, ibid.

[53] D. B. Egan told Maréchal that under Dubois's administration the Mount had incurred a $25,000 debt. D. B. Egan to Maréchal, October 5, 1826, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Box 15 c,d, BCA; Robert Hickey to Maréchal, February 15, 1825, Archbishop Maréchal Papers, Supplement to Box 12A, ibid.; John Power to Cullen, September 15, 1833, July 18, 1834, and J. McGerry to Cullen, September 15, 1834, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, NDA; O'Connor to F. Kenrick, November 23, 1839, ibid.

[54] John Hughes to Purcell, February 24, 1838, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; Power to Cullen, September 15, 1833, Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69, ibid.

[55] O'Connor to F. Kenrick, November 23, 1839, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Tobias Kirby, July 12, 18, 1834, ibid.

[56] Flaget to Propaganda, April 31, 1825, Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[57] Bardstown Seminary was originally called St. Thomas, and subsequently St. Joseph's. There were also two colleges--St. Joseph's and St. Mary's--in Bardstown.

Flaget invited the Jesuits to direct St. Mary's after he had firmly established the institution. Bruté told Résé of his interest in bringing the Jesuits into his Vincennes' Diocese. Before Timon became a bishop he was invited to the Sees of Louisville, Cincinnati, and New York to discuss terms under which his Vincentian Order would teach in dicesan seminaries. Brutê to Résé, January 8, 1835, Detroit Collection, ibid. Expressions of the desire to maintain final educational decision-making power are found in Dubourg to E. Fenwick, January 10, 1826, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.; F. Kenrick to Résé, December 16, 1825, Detroit Collection, ibid.; and Blanc to Purcell, July 28, 1847, Cincinnati Collection, ibid.

[58] John Cheverus to Brutê, October 9, 1816, ibid. Bishops Guy Chabrat, Martin Spalding, Ignatius Reynolds, and John McGill were all Bardstown graduates.

[59] Columba Fox, _The Life of the Right Reverend John Baptist Mary David, 1761-1841: Bishop of Bardstown and Founder of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth_ (New York, 1925), 76, 77; Carroll to Flaget, May 15, 1815, Archbishop Carroll Papers, BCA; Flaget to Brutê, September 21, 1813, January 25, 1815, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; Flaget to European Sulpician Authorities, June 27, 1814, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN; David to Brutê, September 21, 1813, ibid.

[60] Flaget to European Sulpician Authorities, June 27, 1814, ibid.; Carroll to Flaget, May 15, 1815, Archbishop Carroll Papers, BCA.

[61] David explained that he and Flaget decided to make him Coadjutor to Bardstown to "escape" his appointment to Philadelphia and removal to St. Mary's. Far from reticent about these machinations, David--after receiving the brief appointing him Bardstown Coadjutor--told Propaganda that Flaget had requested such action to insure that "no one could take David away from Bardstown." David to Brutê, December 12, 1817, Cincinnati Collection, NDA; David to Propaganda, December 28, 1817 and Flaget to Propaganda, n.d., Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale, ibid.

[62] Flaget and David to French Sulpician Father Garnier, November 1814, January 1816, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[63] Fox, David, 79, 82, 115.

[64] The assumption made throughout the present study that some theological thought, or at least the raw material for theological thought, and therefore an intellectual tradition existed in the early history of the American church has been both ignored and denied. John Tracy Ellis's exposition of Catholic intellectual backwardness has had a great impact on the thinking of scholars interested in American Catholic development. He portrayed the hierarchy as a group of able administrators, who, to protect and Americanize their immigrant flocks, built a strong defensive and one might add non-, if not anti-, intellectual institution. Thomas McAvoy made a similar case, using the sacrifice of the faculty of St. Mary's to make bishops for the expanding church as one of the significant examples of a developing non-intellectual and defensive ghetto mentality within the American church. James Hennesey challenged this thesis. He sought to demonstrate that American bishops at the First Vatican Council (1869) espoused a rather liberal church-state theory that was shaped by the American social and political environment. He did not, however, go far enough. John Tracy Ellis, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life," Thought, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 353-358, 360-372, 374-378, 385, 386; Thomas McAvoy, "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820-1860," Review of Politics, X (January 1948), 13-34; James Hennesey, The First Council of the Vatican: The American Experience (New York, 1963).

[65] Carroll to Plowden, March 12, April 2, 1808, CUA.

[66] Dubois to Purcell, December 28, 1831, October 2, 1832, Mt. St. Mary's Papers, ASN.

[67] Dubois to Purcell, October 2, 1832, ibid.

VIII. CONCLUSION

By 1852 the hierarchy had created a distinctly American church, at least from an institutional standpoint. Flourishing in the permissive social and political climate of the United States, taking advantage of the immersion of the Roman Curia in European affairs, and activated by the turbulent condition of American Catholicism, the bishops developed both a theology and set of procedures to order the relationship of the Roman Church to the American Republic, of episcopacy to Papacy, and of episcopacy to clerics and Catholic constituents. Drawing eclectically on currents of Catholic theology and experience with political republicanism and social pluralism, these men simultaneously became ardent sectarians and daring innovators. They intended to create, and did indeed create, a Catholic church that was in its institutional dimension politically American and spiritually Roman.

On the one hand, it was a church characterized by the liberal theologies of separation of church and state and episcopal collegiality. Ever since Constantine, Christianity's historical fate had been bound up with political repression of men's consciences in the name

XUM

of orthodoxy. And almost all of the early American religious groups seemed intent on propagating that tradition. Pressures for religious freedom in the New World came primarily from the internal fact of pluralism and from the English government itself, exerted not for the sake of democracy but against political domination of any one American group. Of course such pressures likewise affected the attitudes and actions of America's Catholic leaders. Yet some of these leaders also claimed to know as a matter of deepest faith what only bitter experience had taught other American religious groups, such as the New England Puritans. Catholic bishop-theologians recognized that America offered organized religions a wide door to liberty. And the hierarchy chose to open this door, moving from Bishop John Carroll's theological as well as practical statements to the theoretical arguments of Bishops Martin John Spalding, John England, and Michael O'Connor and to the prelates' joint pronouncements confining Papal power to purely spiritual matters, made at their national meetings. When Catholic bishop-theologians developed a liberal church-state theory, thereby making an extraordinary break with the Western Christian tradition, they did so not simply as a matter of strategy but also because they spoke out of a Catholic

XUM

faith as deeply felt as any in the Old World. After all, the bishops, although certainly not indifferent to man's political life, separated the church from the state in order to protect and elevate the spiritual dimension. Reinforcing this commitment to the spiritual mission of the Church, bishop-theologians argued that all Catholic prelates, not just the "chief bishop" (the Pope), ought to be devoted to an ultimate, not a political, ethic.

On the other hand, these men built a church also characterized by the most authoritarian episcopal government in the history of Western Catholicism. Certainly in formulating liberal theories America's bishops were not preoccupied with creating an academic theology. Nor were they unreflective "Jeffersonian" or "Jacksonian" democrats. Indeed their liberal conclusions concerning the Church's relationship to the Republic, and episcopacy to Papacy, clearly reflected their search for means of establishing an ordered, stable, and unified American church. And the bishops found this means to be the rationalization, nationalization, and centralization of the decision-making process. From 1789 through 1820 they fought for and won the privilege of selecting candidates for the American hierarchy. By training and selecting their own colleagues, the bishops were consciously establishing the elitist foundations necessary

XUM

for and compatible with the theology and set of procedures they were developing. After 1829 they protected their quasi-legal privilege of selection and further consolidated and rationalized their hold upon decision-making power by presenting a united front to Rome. At their frequent conventions the bishops not only discussed mutual problems but passed legislation on matters of discipline and faith that would be binding on all American Catholics. In the following decades they met more regularly and legislated more widely than any other national Catholic hierarchy. By instituting the conciliar government, the bishops were putting the concept of episcopal collegiality into practice.

A strategy well adapted to containing Rome's unsystematic but often constraining actions, government through councils was also a means of preserving episcopal authority against American Catholic presbyterian tendencies and regular-secular clerical conflict. For example, in the councils the bishops legislated the destruction of presbyterianism, moving an obstinate laity away from trusteeism toward politicized episcopacy. It was through the council system that the bishops simultaneously nationalized the American church and centralized that institution's decision-making process in a traditional episcopacy. That it is indeed possible by 1852 to speak

XUM

of an American Catholic church with a recognized locus of institutional decision-making power attests to the success of episcopal politicalization in the nineteenth century. In refusing to make the Archdiocese of Baltimore a primate see in 1852, Rome belatedly acknowledged that the American bishops had created a church with the "semblance of a national organization." It was no surprise therefore when after 1852 Rome began to systematize what had been a haphazard approach to the American mission.

Finally conciliar government may also be viewed as the Catholic counterpart of Jacksonian America's political and religious organizational mania. Of course, the Catholic development has been explained on the ground that the bishops' policy was principally psychological, collectively reflecting a minority personality in American life. But by 1852 Catholics were the largest single denomination in the United States. Furthermore, the bishops' organizational impulse coincided with a similar post-1812 national political and religious phenomenon. Indeed, the emergence of political parties and strongly institutionalized religious denominations was one characteristic of this period in American history. Within this context, it is at best questionable to remain loyal to the accepted assumption that Catholic activity

XUM

simply reflected a defensive "ghetto" mentality. At the very least this much can be said: the Catholic hierarchy clearly did not regard itself, nor did it seem to have been regarded by its contemporaries, as somehow secluded, preoccupied by concerns that were not of great moment to anybody else, beset by internal issues of little import to American national development. It might be more accurate, and certainly more useful, to view the Catholic hierarchy's seemingly paradoxical espousal of liberal theologies and erection of sectarian religious boundaries as part of the larger process by which American political and religious groups in the nineteenth century institutionalized themselves.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BIOGRAPHICAL MATERIALS

TABLE A1. Codebook for Biographical Data

Variable	Column	Value
ID	1-19	Name (last name first)
001	20	Appointment Authority 1. United States 2. Rome
002	21-22	Birthplace 1. France 2. Ireland 3. United States 4. Belgium 5. Canada 6. England 7. Germany 8. Italy 9. Mexico 10. Spain 11. Switzerland
003	23	Generation (U.S.-born) 1. Second 2. Third or More 9. NA[a]
004	24-27	Year Arrived in U.S. 9999 Born in U.S.
005	28-29	Age Arrived in U.S. 99 Born in U.S.
006	30	Education--Country 1. United States 2. Europe 3. Both

---

[a] NA designates nonapplicable and was coded as 9, 99, or 9999.

XUM

TABLE A1. Continued

Variable	Column	Value
007	31	Education--Kind 1. College/University and Seminary Separately 2. Seminary Only 3. College/University and Seminary Combined
008	32-33	Age Ordained
009	34	Regular Clergy 1. Yes 2. No
010	35	Religious Order 1. SS (Sulpician) 2. SJ (Society of Jesus) 3. CM (Vincentians) 4. OP (Dominicans) 5. Other
011	36-37	Years in America Before Elevation 99 Born in U.S.
012	38	Pastoral Work Before Elevation 1. Yes 2. No
013	39-40	Years in Pastoral Work Before Elevation
014	41	Pastoral Work--Country 1. United States 2. Europe 3. Both 9. NA
015	42-43	Years in Pastoral Work, U.S.
016	44-45	Years in Pastoral Work, Non-U.S.

XUM

TABLE A1. Continued

Variable	Column	Value
017	46	Administrative Work Before Elevation 1. Yes 2. No
018	47-48	Years in Administrative Work Before Elevation
019	49	Administrative Work--Country 1. United States 2. Europe 3. Both 9. NA
020	50-51	Years in Administrative Work, U.S.
021	52-53	Years in Administrative Work, Non-U.S.
022	54	Administrative Work--Type 1. Diocesan 2. Educational 3. Other 4. Diocesan and Educational 5. Educational and Other 6. Diocesan and Other 9. NA
023	55	Teaching Before Elevation 1. Yes 2. No
024	56-57	Years in Teaching Before Elevation
025	58	Teaching--Country 1. United States 2. Europe 3. Both 9. NA

XUM

TABLE A1. Continued

Variable	Column	Value
026	59-60	Years in Teaching, U.S.
027	61-62	Years in Teaching, Non-U.S.
028	63	Teaching--Type 1. College/University Only 2. Seminary Only 3. College/University and Seminary Separately 4. College/University and Seminary Combined 9. NA
029	64-65	Age Appointed Bishop
030	66-67	Years to 1852 as an American Bishop
031	68-69	Total Years as an American Bishop
032	70	Promoted to Archbishop 1. Yes 2. No
033	71-72	Age Appointed Archbishop
034	73-74	Years to 1852 as an American Archbishop
035	75-76	Total Years as an American Archbishop

APPENDIX B

SOME ECCLESIASTICAL TERMS[a]

Archbishop/Metropolitan--A bishop with jurisdiction over other bishops.

Archbishopric/Archdiocese/Metropolitanate/Province--The area an archbishop administers.

Auxiliary Bishop--A titular bishop who assists a bishop ordinary in the capacity of auxiliary to the ordinary bishop and not to the diocese.

Bishop--A successor of the Apostles, possessing apostolic authority in his threefold character as priest, teacher, and pastor of the faithful. By canon law his diocesan jurisdiction is "ordinary," not delegated. The body of bishops, all the resident bishops of the world, succeeds to the body of the Apostles in a collective sense. That is, bishops succeed individually to the Apostles in the essential right of sacrifice and of absolution, and in the integral power of ordaining; but the body of bishops succeeds collectively to the universal power of jurisdiction.

Cardinal--A bishop who advises the Pope.

Cardinal-Prefect--A cardinal who administers one of the Papal agencies.

Cleric/Father/Priest--A person who has been given the authority to administer the sacraments of the Church.

Coadjutor Bishop--A titular bishop who assists a bishop ordinary in the discharge of his episcopal duties. He is coadjutor of a diocese, not to the ordinary bishop.

Communicant--A practicing Catholic.

---

[a] These definitions apply to the period under study, 1789 to 1852. Some are no longer used, others now have different meanings. Elizabeth Lunskey in *The Government of the Catholic Church* (New York, 1952) gives a simplified explanation of ecclesiastical government.

XUM

Councils--Although the terms council and synod are interchangeable, the word council has come to be used: for the general or ecumenical assemblies of all bishops meeting with and under the presidency of the Pope, who has the exclusive right to convoke them; for plenary or national assemblies of all the bishops of a nation under the presidency of the senior archbishop or of an apostolic delegate appointed by the Pope, whose permission is required for such a gathering; for provincial assemblies or meetings of the bishops of a province under the metropolitan who presides over them. A synod is convoked by a diocesan bishop, theoretically the sole lawgiver at such an assembly, as a meeting of all those diocesan clerics that have the right or privilege to attend. Legislation is drafted and promulgated, with the approval of the Holy See, at a plenary or national council for the church in the entire nation, at a provincial council for an archbishopric, and at a local synod for a particular diocese.

Diocese--The area a bishop administers.

Excommunication--An ecclesiastical censure that bars one from communion with the Church.

Pope/Pontiff/Holy Father--In the hierarchy of order the Pope, as Bishop of Rome, possesses no more sacramental power than any other bishop. In the hierarchy of jurisdiction, however, he is set above other bishops, singly and collectively considered, by virtue of the doctrine of the primacy of the See of Peter and by the doctrine of Papal infallibility. The doctrine declares the Pope's definition of dogma to be infallibie, on those occasions when he speaks ex cathedra as Vicar of Christ. Of course, the doctrine of Papal infallibility was not in effect during the period under study.

Prefect-Apostolic--A priest acting as a delegate for the Holy See in an area where the ordinary hierarchy has not been established.

Prefecture-Apostolic--The area administered by a prefect-apostolic.

Prelate--A synonym for bishop.

Regular/Ordinary Clergy--Clerics/Fathers/Priests who belong to religious societies or orders.

Religious--Any cleric or nun.

Residential Bishop--A bishop who resides in his diocese and has "ordinary" not delegated diocesan jurisdiction.

Roman Curia--The Pope's bureaucracy.

Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith or Propaganda)--An administrative agency that exercises extensive jurisdiction in areas designated as missionary territory. It is directly responsible to the Pope.

Secular/Diocesan Clergy--Clerics/Fathers/Priests who do not belong to a religious society or order.

Suffragan Bishop--A bishop who is subject to or subordinate to an archbishop.

Suffragan See--A diocese that is located in an archdiocese.

Titular Bishop--Bishops who exercise delegated not "ordinary" jurisdiction, receiving such only in their capacity as vicars-apostolic, administrators, or vicars-general, or as it is given them by the bishops ordinary or the Holy See. A titular bishop may be an auxiliary bishop, assisting another bishop, or a coadjutor bishop, assisting a bishop ordinary in the discharge of his episcopal duties.

Vicar-Apostolic--A titular bishop who is acting as a delegate of the Holy See in regions where the ordinary hierarchy has not yet been established.

Vicariate-Apostolic--The area administered by a vicar-apostolic.

Vicar-General--The deputy of a bishop who aids the prelate in the discharge of his episcopal functions.

APPENDIX C

THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY, 1789-1852

TABLE A2. Members of the American Hierarchy Arranged Chronologically According to Date of Appointment from November 6, 1789 to May 9, 1852[a]

Bishop	Year of Appointment
+John Carroll	1789
+Leonard Neale	1795
John Cheverus	1808
Michael Egan	
Benedict Flaget	
John Connolly	1814
William Dubourg	1815
John David	1817
+Ambrose Maréchal	
Henry Conwell	1819
John England	1820
Patrick Kelly	
Edward Fenwick	1821
Joseph Rosati	1822

[a] When two or more prelates were appointed on the same day, the arrangement becomes alphabetical. The election rather than consecration date was used to establish the proper chronology, since in the Latin, or Western Church, precedence is governed by the former; a prefixing cross (+) indicates an archbishop of an American see. John Cheverus and William Dubourg became archbishops of French sees, and therefore were not included as American archbishops.

XUM

TABLE A2. Continued

Bishop	Year of Appointment
Benedict Fenwick	1825
Michael Portier	
John Dubois	1826
+James Whitfield	1828
Leo De Neckére	1829
+Francis Kenrick	1830
+John Purcell	1833
Frederick Résé	
+Samuel Eccleston	1834
Guy Chabrat	
Simon Bruté	
William Clancy	
+Anthony Blanc	1835
John Loras	1837
Richard Miles	
+John Hughes	
Celestine De la Hailandiére	1839
Francisco Garcia Diego y Moreno	1840
John Chanche	
Richard Whelan	
+Peter Kenrick	1841

TABLE A2. Continued

Bishop	Year of Appointment
Peter Lefevere	
+John Odin	
Michael O'Connor	1843
John Fitzpatrick	
+John McCloskey	
Andrew Byrne	
+John Henni	
William Quarter	
Ignatius Reynolds	
William Tyler	
+Francis Blanchet	
Modeste Demers	1846
Augustin Blanchet	
John Bazin	1847
Louis Rappe	
John Timon	
+Martin John Spalding	1848
James De Saint-Palais	
James Van de Velde	

TABLE A2. Continued

Bishop	Year of Appointment
+Joseph Alemany	1850
Joseph Cretin	
Francis Gartland	
John McGill	
John Miége	
Bernard O'Reilly	

XUM

APPENDIX D

CHURCH ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1789-1852

TABLE A3. American Sees Arranged Chronologically According to Date of Erection from November 6, 1789 to May 9, 1852[a]

See	Year of Erection
+Baltimore	1789 (1808)
+New Orleans	1793 (1850)
Boston	1808
Bardstown to Louisville	
+New York	(1850)
Philadelphia	
Richmond	1820
Charleston	
+Cincinnati	1821 (1850)
+St. Louis	1826 (1847)
Mobile-Birmingham	1829
Detroit	1833
Indianapolis	1834
Dubuque	1837
Nashville	
Natchez-Jackson	

---

[a] A prefixing cross (+) designates an archbishopric (province, metropolitanate); a second year of erection designates when a see was raised to metropolitan rank.

XUM

TABLE A3. Continued

See	Year of Erection
Los Angeles	1840
Pittsburgh	1843
Hartford	
Chicago	
Little Rock	
Milwaukee	
+Portland in Oregon	1846 (1850)
Albany	1847
Buffalo	
Cleveland	
Galveston-Houston	
Seattle	1850
Savannah	
St. Paul	
Wheeling	

XUM

APPENDIX E

STATISTICAL DATA ON THE FIFTY-ONE BISHOPS CHOSEN BY THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

TABLE A4. Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Years

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=36)
Mean	1814.9	1815.9	1822.0	1817.6
Median	1816.0	1815.0	1821.0	1816.5
Mode	1792.0	1826.0	---	1792.0
Minimum	1791.0	1798.0	1805.0	1791.0
Maximum	1847.0	1839.0	1841.0	1847.0
Range	56.0	41.0	36.0	56.0
Standard Deviation	20.4	14.8	9.0	16.5

XUM

TABLE A5. Arrival in the United States of American-Chosen Bishops by Ages

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=36)
Mean	29.6	20.9	26.6	25.7
Median	28.5	23.0	25.0	27.5
Mode	---	25.0	---	25.0
Minimum	20.0	1.0	10.0	1.0
Maximum	40.0	41.0	47.0	47.0
Range	20.0	40.0	37.0	46.0
Standard Deviation	6.1	12.0	10.0	9.6

XUM

TABLE A6. Ordination Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by Years

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	American (N=15)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=51)
Mean	24.6	25.2	25.2	27.7	25.6
Median	24.1	25.0	25.0	25.5	26.5
Mode	24.0	24.0	24.0	---	24.0
Minimum	22.0	23.0	22.0	22.0	22.0
Maximum	29.0	29.0	29.0	39.0	39.0
Range	7.0	6.0	7.0	17.0	17.0
Standard Deviation	2.2	2.0	1.8	4.2	3.0

XUM

TABLE A7. Length of Time before Elevation that American-Chosen Bishops were in the Country by Years

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=36)
Mean	17.6	18.4	17.0	17.6
Median	16.5	17.0	12.0	18.5
Mode	12.0	16.0	9.0	---
Minimum	3.0	4.0	6.0	3.0
Maximum	38.0	43.0	36.0	43.0
Range	35.0	39.0	30.0	40.0
Standard Deviation	9.9	11.4	10.1	10.3

XUM

TABLE A8. Elevation Ages of American-Chosen Bishops by Years

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	American (N=15)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=51)
Mean	45.6	38.9	41.9	41.0	41.8
Median	45.5	38.5	43.0	37.5	44.0
Mode	---	47.0	---	---	33.0
Minimum	30.0	33.0	31.0	30.0	30.0
Maximum	62.0	47.0	54.0	58.0	62.0
Range	32.0	14.0	23.0	28.0	32.0
Standard Deviation	7.9	5.3	7.8	8.5	7.4

XUM

TABLE A9. Incumbency to 1852 of American-Chosen Bishops by Years

	French (N=18)	Irish (N=10)	American (N=15)	Other (N=8)	Total (N=51)
Mean	12.2	10.7	12.3	8.4	10.9
Median	11.1	10.0	11.8	8.5	13.5
Mode	11.0	9.0	5.0	4.0	11.0
Minimum	1.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	1.0
Maximum	41.0	22.0	26.0	21.0	41.0
Range	40.0	20.0	24.0	17.0	40.0
Standard Deviation	9.7	6.6	6.9	5.2	7.7

APPENDIX F

STATISTICAL DATA ON THE NINE BISHOPS CHOSEN BY ROME

TABLE A10. Arrival in the United States of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	1821.6	1843.7	1831.4
Median	1827.0	---	1837.0
Mode	1820.0	1846.0	1820.0
Minimum	1814.0	1840.0	1814.0
Maximum	1834.0	1846.0	1846.0
Range	20.0	6.0	32.0
Standard Deviation	7.3	4.3	5.1

TABLE A11. Arrival in the United States of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Ages

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	48.4	47.2	47.8
Median	41.0	48.5	48.0
Mode	---	---	---
Minimum	32.0	37.0	32.0
Maximum	72.0	55.0	72.0
Range	40.0	18.0	40.0
Standard Deviation	16.1	6.7	13.3

XUM

TABLE A12. Ordination Ages of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	23.4	24.5	23.9
Median	23.0	24.0	23.0
Mode	23.0	---	23.0
Minimum	21.0	23.0	21.0
Maximum	28.0	27.0	28.0
Range	7.0	4.0	7.0
Standard Deviation	2.7	1.4	2.2

TABLE A13. Elevation Ages of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	48.2	47.2	47.7
Median	46.0	48.5	46.0
Mode	---	---	---
Minimum	32.0	37.0	32.0
Maximum	71.0	55.0	71.0
Range	39.0	18.0	39.0
Standard Deviation	15.2	6.7	12.8

XUM

TABLE A14. Incumbency to 1852 of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	13.4	6.5	9.9
Median	13.2	7.5	10.4
Mode	---	6.0	6.0
Minimum	2.0	6.0	2.0
Maximum	23.0	9.0	23.0
Range	21.0	3.0	21.0
Standard Deviation	8.9	2.2	7.2

TABLE A15. Pastoral Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years[a]

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	17.0	19.5	18.2
Median	---	21.5	14.5
Mode	6.0	---	---
Minimum	6.0	10.0	6.0
Maximum	38.0	25.0	38.0
Range	32.0	15.0	32.0
Standard Deviation	10.0	5.9	10.8

[a] Four Irishmen and all the "others" had pastorates, all had them exclusively in Europe.

XUM

TABLE A16. Administrative Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years[a]

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	14.5	14.0	14.3
Median	---	---	14.5
Mode	---	---	---
Minimum	4.0	5.0	4.0
Maximum	25.0	25.0	25.0
Range	21.0	20.0	21.0
Standard Deviation	10.0	9.0	9.7

[a] Four Irishmen and two "others" had been administrators. All had such training only in Europe.

TABLE A17. Teaching Apprenticeships of Roman-Chosen Bishops by Years[a]

	Irish (N=5)	Other (N=4)	Total (N=9)
Mean	3.0	4.0	3.5
Median	---	---	4.5
Mode	---	---	5.0
Minimum	1.0	4.0	1.0
Maximum	5.0	4.0	5.0
Range	4.0	0.0	4.0
Standard Deviation	2.8	0.0	1.4

[a] Three Irishmen and one "other" had taught. All had done so only in Europe.

XUM

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

XUM

Manuscripts

Baltimore. Archives of the Maryland Province of the Society of Jesus (MSJA). Jesuit Letters and Papers.

Baltimore. Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA). Archbishop Ambrose Maréchal Papers.

Baltimore. Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA). Archbishop John Carroll Papers.

Baltimore. Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA). Archbishop Leonard Neale Papers.

Baltimore. Baltimore Cathedral Archives (BCA). Archbishop Samuel Eccleston Papers.

Boston. Archdiocesan Archives of Boston (AAB). Benedict Fenwick Letters and Papers.

Boston. Library of the American Unitarian Association. John Cheverus Letters and Papers.

Nazareth (Kentucky). Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN). Mt. St. Mary's Papers.

Nazareth (Kentucky). Archives of the Sisters of Nazareth (ASN). Roman Letters and Papers.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Bardstown-Louisville, Kentucky Papers, 1811-67.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Charleston, South Carolina Papers.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Cincinnati Collection.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Detroit Collection.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Irish College Correspondence, 1828-69.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). New Orleans Collection.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Orestes A. Brownson Papers.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Records of the English College, Rome, 1821-34.

Notre Dame. University of Notre Dame Archives (NDA). Scritture riferite nei Congressi, America Centrale.

Philadelphia. American Catholic Historical Society Archives, St. Charles Borromeo Seminary (ACHS). Philadelphia Papers.

St. Louis. St. Louis Archdiocesan Archives (SLA). St. Louis Papers.

Washington, D.C. Department of Archives and MSS, Catholic University of America (CUA). John Carroll Letters and Papers.

Newspapers

American Museum (Philadelphia), June 10, 1789.

Columbia Magazine (Philadelphia), December, 1787.

United States Gazette (New York), May 9, 1789.

Books

Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Totious Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae. Baltimori Habiti Anno 1852. Baltimore, 1853.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967.

Baisnée, Jules A. *France and the Establishment of the American Catholic Hierarchy: The Myth of French Interference, 1783-1784*. Baltimore, 1934.

Bellarmine, Robert. Trans. Kathleen E. Murphy. *De Laicis, or the Treatise on Civil Government*. New York, 1928.

Billington, Ray Allen. *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860*. New York, 1938.

XUM

Brent, John Carroll. *Biographical Sketch of the Most Reverend John Carroll*. Baltimore, 1843.

Brooksania, or, The Controversy between Senator Brooks and Archbishop Hughes. New York, 1855.

Byrne, William, et al. *History of the Catholic Church in the New England States*. 2 vols. Boston, 1899.

Carroll, John. *Eulogy on George Washington*. New York, 1931.

Casey, Thomas F. *The Sacred Congregation De Propaganda Fide and the Revision of the First Provincial Council of Baltimore, 1829-1830*. Rome, 1957.

Catholicism In America. Ed. Philip Gleason. New York, 1970.

Clarke, Richard H. *History of the Catholic Church in the United States: Biographical Sketches of the Living Bishops*. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1890.

________. *Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States*. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1888.

Code, Joseph B. *Dictionary of the American Hierarchy*. New York, 1940, 1964.

Concilia Provincialia, Baltimori Habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849. Baltimore, 1851.

Connolly, James F. *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America, 1853-1854*. Rome, 1952.

Cross, Robert D. *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America*. Chicago, 1958.

Daley, John M. *Georgetown University: Origin and Early Years*. Washington, D.C., 1957.

Daubree, Paul et Cailleux, eds. *Oeuvres Completes*. 12 vols. Paris, 1836, 1837.

David, John. *Catechism of the Diocese of Bardstown*. Bardstown, Kentucky, 1825.

Dawson, Christopher. *Beyond Politics*. New York, 1939.

XUM

Dignan, Patrick J. *A History of the Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property in the United States*. New York, 1935.

Ellis, John Tracy. *A Guide to American Catholic History*. Milwaukee, 1959.

________. *American Catholicism*. 2nd rev. ed. Chicago, 1969.

________. *Catholics in Colonial America*. Baltimore, 1965.

________. *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America*. Washington, D.C., 1946.

Formisano, Ronald. *The Birth of Mass Political Parties: Michigan, 1827-1861*. Princeton, 1971.

Fox, Columba. *The Life of the Right Reverend John Baptist Mary David, 1761-1841: Bishop of Bardstown and Founder of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth*. New York, 1925.

Geiger, Mary Virginia. Daniel Carroll, *A Framer of the Constitution*. Washington, D.C., 1943.

Gleason, Philip. *The Conservative Reformers: German-American Catholics and the Social Order*. Notre Dame, Indiana, 1968.

Greeley, Andrew. *The Catholic Experience: An Interpretation of the History of American Catholicism*. New York, 1967.

Greene, Joseph. *Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1737-1832*. New York, 1932.

Guilday, Peter. *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884*. 2nd ed. New York, 1969.

________. *The Catholic Church in Virginia, 1815-1822*. New York, 1924.

________. *The Life and Times of John Carroll*. 2 vols. New York, 1922.

________. *The Life and Times of John England, 1786-1845*. 2 vols. New York, 1927.

XUM

Hackett, James Dominick. *Bishops of the United States of Irish Birth and Descent*. New York, 1936.

Hassard, John. *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, First Archbishop of New York*. New York, 1866.

Hay, Malcolm. *Failure in the Far East*. Philadelphia, 1957.

Hennesey, James. *The First Council of the Vatican: The American Experience*. New York, 1963.

Hughes, Thomas. *History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Colonial and Federal*. 2 vols. London, 1917.

Lamennais, Félicité. *De la religion considerée dans ses rapports avec l'ordre politique et civil*. Paris, 1826.

________. *Des Progrés de La Revolution et de La Guerre contre L'Eglise*. Paris, 1829.

Lannie, Vincent P. *Public Money and Parochial Education: Bishop Hughes, Governor Seward and the New York School Controversy*. Cleveland, 1968.

Laski, Harold J. *Authority in the Modern State*. New Haven, 1927.

Love, Thomas. *John Courtney Murray: Contemporary Church-State Theory*. New York, 1964.

McAvoy, Thomas. *The Great Crisis in American Catholic History, 1895-1900*. Chicago, 1957.

McCormick, Richard P. *The Second American Party System: Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era*. Chapel Hill, 1966.

McLoughlin, William. "The Role of Religion in the Revolution: Liberty of Conscience and Cultural Cohesion in the New Nation." In *Essays on the American Revolution*. Eds. S. Kurtz and J. Hutson.

Mead, Sidney E. *The Lively Experiment: The Shaping of Christianity in America*. New York, 1963.

XUM

Melville, Annabelle. *Jean Lefebvre de Cheverus, 1768-1836*. Milwaukee, 1958.

________. *John Carroll of Baltimore: Founder of the American Catholic Hierarchy*. New York, 1955.

Merwick, Donna. *Boston Priests, 1848-1910: A Study of Social and Intellectual Change*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1973.

National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919. Ed. Peter Guilday. Washington, D.C., 1923.

Nelli, Humbert S. *Italians In Chicago, 1880-1930: A Study In Ethnic Mobility*. New York, 1970.

Nolan, Hugh. *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851*. Washington, D.C.

Nuesse, Joseph. *The Social Thought of American Catholics, 1634-1829*. Washington, D.C., 1945.

O'Daniel, Victor. *The Right Rev. Edward Dominic Fenwick, O.P*. Washington, D.C., 1937.

Riley, Elihu S. *Correspondence of "First Citizen," Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and "Antillon," Daniel Dulany, Jr., 1773*. Baltimore, 1902.

Ruane, Joseph William. *The Beginnings of the Society of St. Sulpice in the United States, 1791-1829*. Washington, D.C., 1935.

Shaughnessy, Gerald. *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* New York, 1925.

Shea, John Gilmary. *The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church in the United States*. New York, 1886-1892.

________. *The History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. 4 vols. New York, 1886-1892.

Spalding, Martin. *Sketches of the Life and Times and Character of the Rt. Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget*. Louisville, Kentucky, 1852.

Sweeney, David F. *The Life of John Lancaster Spalding*. New York, 1965.

XUM

The Complete Works of the Most Reverend John Hughes, D.D. Ed. Lawrence Kehoe. 2 vols. New York, 1865.

The Laws of Texas, 1822-1897. Comp. H. P. N. Gammel. n.p., Texas, 1898.

The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid. Ed. Frederick H. Zwierlein. 3 vols. Rochester, New York, 1925-1927.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York, 1970.

The Works of the Rt. Rev. John England, First Bishop of Charleston. Ed. Sebastian Messmer. 7 vols. Cleveland, 1908.

Thompson, Joseph A. *El Gran Capitan: Jose de la Guerre, a Historical Biographical Study.* Los Angeles, 1961.

Weber, Max. "Politics As A Vocation." In *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* Eds. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York, 1958.

Weninger, Francis X. *On the Apostolical and Infallible Authority of the Pope When Teaching the Faithful and of His Relation to a General Council.* n.p., 1868.

Wharton, Charles. *A Concise View of the Principal Points of Controversy Between the Protestant and Roman Churches.* New York, 1817.

Articles

Brislen, M. "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale." *Historical Records and Studies*, XXXIV (1954), 2-112.

"Correspondence of Archbishop Carroll and the Irish Church." *Catholic Historical Review*, XV (December 1865), 123-138.

Corrigan, Owen Bernard. "Chronological List Showing the Dates of Appointment of the Bishops of the United States." *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, XXXV (1924), 295-324.

________. "Chronology of the American Hierarchy." *Catholic Historical Review*, III (July, 1917), 22-33, 151-164 and IV (1918), 80-83.

________. "Chronology of the Catholic Hierarchy of the United States." *Catholic Historical Review*, I (January 1916), 367-389.

________. "Episcopal Succession in the United States." *Catholic Historical Review*, II (July 1917), 127-145.

________. "Rise of the Hierarchy in the United States." *Catholic Historical Review*, II (October 1916), 282-301.

________. "Titular Sees of the American Hierarchy." *Catholic Historical Review*, VI (October 1920), 322-330.

Ellis, John Tracy. "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life." *Thought*, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 353-358, 360-372, 374-378, 385, 386.

Guilday, Peter. "Guide to the Biographical Sources of the American Hierarchy (A-L)." *Catholic Historical Review*, V (1919-1920), 120-128, 290-296 and VI (1920-1921), 128-132, 267-371.

________. "Trusteeism." *Historical Records and Studies*, (New York, 1928), 7-73.

Hanley, Thomas. "Archbishop Carroll and the French Revolution." *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXXI (September-December 1960), 67-72.

Hennesey, James. " Prelude to Vatican I: American Bishops and the Definition of the Immaculate Conception." *Theological Studies*, XXV (September, 1964), 409-419.

________. "The Baltimore Council of 1866: An American Syllabus." *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia*, LXXVI (March-December 1965), 157-172.

McAvoy, Thomas. "The American Catholic Minority in the Later Nineteenth Century." Review of Politics, XV (July 1953), 275-302.

________. "The Catholic Minority in the United States, 1789-1821." *Historical Records and Studies*, XXXIXXL (1952), 33-50.

XUM

________. "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820-1860." Review of Politics, X (January, 1948), 13-34.

McClelland, Vincent A. "Scots, Jesuits, and Episcopal Authority, 1603-1773." Dublin Review, DVIII (Summer 1966), 111-132.

McNamara, Robert F. "Trusteeism in the Atlantic States, 1785-1863." Catholic Historical Review, XXX (July 1944), 135-154.

"Minutes of the Trustees of the German Religious Society of Roman Catholics called the Church of the Holy Trinity in the City of Philadelphia." Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, XXI, 23-27.

Murray, John Courtney. "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State in the Light of History." Theological Studies, X (June 1949), 177-234.

________. "Leo XIII On Church and State: The General Structure of the Controversy." Theological Studies, XIV (March 1953), 1-30.

________. "Pluralism in America." Thought, CCXCI (Spring-Winter 1954-55), 165-208.

________. "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power." Theological Studies, IX (December 1948), 491-535.

________. "Separation of Church and State: True and False Concepts." America, LXXVI (October-March 1946-1947), 541-545.

________. "The Church and the Council: The Drama and the Issues Behind the Speeches 'on the Nature of the Church.'" America, CIX (July-December 1963), 451-455.

O'Daniel, Victor. "The Right Rev. Richard Luke Concanen, O.P., The First Bishop of New York (1747-1810)." Catholic Historical Review, I and II (January 1916), 400-421, 19-45.

Weber, N. A. "The Rise of the National Catholic Churches in the United States." Catholic Historical Review, I (January 1816), 422-434.

Unpublished Secondary Sources

Alisauskas, Arunas. "The Lithuanians." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Briggs, John. "The Italians." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Connors, Margaret E. "Kinship and Culture among the Catholic Families of Albany, N.Y." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Dewey, Donald O. "James Madison's 'Public' as Interpreter of the Constitution." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Dolan, Jay P. "American Catholics and Popular Religion." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Gregoire, Paul Leo. "The Relations Between Félicité de Lamennais and Simon de Bruté." M.A. thesis, University of Notre Dame, 1961.

Hueston, Robert F. "The Irish." (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

Reher, Mary. "Americanism--A Theological Issue?" (Unpublished paper in the writer's possession.)

XUM